HISTORIANS AND HISTORIOGRAPHY IN MODERN INDIA

First Published in June 1973
Reprinted in 1976

Published by Dr. S. P. Sen, Director
Institute of Historical Studies
CALCUTTA

First published in June 1973
Reprinted in 1976

© Institute of Historical Studies 1973

Published by Dr. S. P. Sen
Director, Institute of Historical Studies
35 Theatre Road, Calcutta 17 (India)

Price : Rs. 100 (India)
U.S. $ 25.00 or its equivalent in any other
foreign currency

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

Printed in India by Pradip Kumar Chatterjee
at The Eton Press Private Ltd., 43 Aurobindo Sarani, Calcutta 5

A word about the criteria of selection. For obvious reasons we have not included any living historian, although some of them may have been more eminent and may have made greater contributions to historical studies than some of those whose names are included in the present volume. In a later edition, perhaps, many new names may be added to make the volume more up-to-date. In selecting the names in the present volume, more attention has naturally been paid to the pioneers in different fields of Indian history. Practically all the well-known historians of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth have been included.

We are quite conscious that our list of names may not please everybody. There are regional and sectional interests which would like to see more names of their particular group or liking included in the volume. We deliberately refrained from making the list too long to please these regional or sectional interests. Our purpose was not to produce a comprehensive Directory of Historians on the lines of the Telephone Directory, but to focus attention on the writings, methodology, ideas, bias, etc. of only the prominent historians in different fields of historical studies. That, in our view, is more useful and instructive than a Directory-like account of Indian historians.

We have the satisfaction that we have not left out any particular field in Indian historical studies in which substantial contributions have been made from the middle of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth. Archaeology, Numismatics, Epigraphy, Genealogy, Political History, Administrative History, Social and Economic History, etc. are all represented by at least a few of the more well-known names. No doubt, during the period under review, some of the fields like Economic and Social History, etc. have not been developed to the same extent as some of the other fields, e.g. Political and Administrative History, Genealogy, etc. If in spite of that clearly known situation we are charged for having neglected some of the fields of history, we are helpless.

To fit in with the main objective of the volume and to maintain some uniformity of treatment among the papers, a broad outline was laid down for the Contributors to put proper emphasis on the different aspects of a critical study of the historians selected. For the convenience of readers in understanding our approach and judging how far our basic ideas have been followed by different Contributors, we give below the pattern laid down:

(i) A short biographical sketch of the historian.
(ii) A critical review of his writings, both major works and journal articles (arranged either chronologically or according to subject matter that may be appropriate in any particular case).
(iii) The methodology followed by the historian, including his ideas of history, bias, etc.
(iv) Influence on contemporary and later historians.

An explanation about the arrangement of the papers. The papers on Indian historians have been put first, followed by those on British historians. The arrangement of papers on Indian historians has been on the basis of the following sectional divisions: (i) Ancient History; (ii) Medieval History; (iii) Regional History (the Marathas, the Sikhs, the Rajputs, etc.); and (iv) Modern History. Within each division the chronological order has been followed. Some critics may complain that this is much too orthodox in conception and that the papers should have been arranged according to the special fields of study—archaeology, political history, administrative history, social history, economic history, religious history, etc. Our answer is that, for the period we have chosen such a division was clearly not possible. The writings of many historians were not confined to any of these specific divisions but covered a much wider range. It would have been a most baffling task to decide whether to put a particular historian in one group or another. Although it has become the latest fashion to group historians on the basis of their special fields of study, it was not this conception which guided the early historians to write. Few of them confined themselves to only one field of interest. Considering this factor, we have followed the only sensible course possible in arranging the papers.

The papers themselves will bring out the different schools of thought —followers of literary evidence, believers in archaeological evidence, worshippers of Marxian interpretation, advocates of ultra-nationalist viewpoint or those who sought to justify British rule. The list also includes revivalists and reformists, advocates of regional pride or communal prejudice, followers of the conflicting schools of 'civic duty' and 'academic rectitude', as also believers in the theory of economic drain or protagonists of economic progress under British rule. Finally, there was the school which looked beyond India and advocated an Asian outlook.

In selecting the names of British historians we have narrowed our interest to those who lived and wrote in India and only pioneers in any particular field of study, like Grant Duff (the Marathas), Cunningham (the Sikhs), Tod (the Rajputs), Wilks (Mysore), Hunter (an Imperialist historian), Vincent Smith (Ancient History) and Moreland (Economic History). A few more names could, with justice, have been included, but we have to draw the line at some point. Lengthening the list might have created unnecessary complications, without making the volume more useful and instructive.

In tracing the evolution of historiography in modern India, it will be obvious from the papers included in the volume that it started with a critical study and reconstruction of the history of the ancient period. Historians' interest remained confined to that period for nearly half a century before it spread out in a significant way to the medieval and the modern period. It is also significant that the centres of historical studies during

the first phase were Calcutta and Bombay. The reason why historical studies in modern India started with the ancient period is not difficult to understand. Western scholars in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries had started the trend by turning their attention to ancient Indian religion, literature, philosophy, languages, etc. Their pioneering studies had brought out the glories of the ancient period which inevitably created a sense of pride among the Western-educated Indians in their ancient heritage. This again started a new interest among Indian scholars in the history of their ancient past and encouraged them to make critical studies on their own, with the help of their special advantage in utilising the Indian language source-material and their intimate acquaintance with the Indian cultural traditions which had survived the onslaughts of centuries. They were also greatly influenced and helped by the work of the Asiatic Societies of Bengal and Bombay. The Indian scholars fully imbibed Western historical ideas and mastered the scientific methods then prevalent in the West and went ahead in the exploration of their country's ancient past. Their progress was surprisingly quick and remarkable, and within fifty years they made significant contributions in all aspects of the study of the ancient period. By the early decades of the twentieth century, so far as studies in Ancient History were concerned, they had most ably carried the torch much further than what the early Western scholars had done.

Some motivated criticisms have been raised in recent years against what has been termed as an undue concentration on the ancient (or Hindu) period in the first phase of historical studies in India. The critics contend that this had led to a spirit of Hindu revivalism, creating a split between the Hindus and the Muslims. It is a most unjustified charge, prompted no doubt by a contemporary desire to emphasise the composite character of Indian society and cultural heritage. The critics, however, ignore that in every country when there is a revival of consciousness of national identity, people invariably turn back to what they consider as their Classical Age and seek to derive new inspiration from that heritage. They do not view other periods of their history in the same light. So in India if historical studies in the modern period turned to the Classical Age for inspiration, there is no justification to call it a deliberate attempt at Hindu revivalism. Nor is there any justification to ignore the palpable fact that for 99.9% of those who follow other religions than Hinduism to-day the Classical Age is the same as for the Hindus. A change of religion does not alter the fact that the epics, the literature, the philosophy and the entire culture of ancient India constitute the common heritage of all Indians irrespective of their religious differences to-day.

It was not till the early decades of the twentieth century that Indian scholars turned to a study of the medieval period in any significant way. The pioneer in this field of study was Sir Jadunath Sarkar whose contributions are acknowledged even to-day as the greatest. His influence in the

field was supreme for many years until the development of newer schools of Medieval History. One interesting factor to notice is that, as in the case of the ancient period, in the case of the medieval period also the beginning of historical studies was inspired by regional pride and the conscious desire to recapture the memory of old glories. Thus were born studies in Maratha History, Sikh History, Rajput History, etc. Very fine work was done in the course of these studies, by bringing to light massive quantities of old records written in the local languages. Grant Duff, Tod and Cunningham, although pioneers in their respective fields, did not, quite understandably, have the same advantage as those who carried the torch further in the different regions. Rajwade, Khare and Sardesai, Shyamaldas and Ojha, Sita Ram Kohli and Indu Bhushan Banerjee put the studies in Maratha, Rajput and Sikh histories respectively on stronger grounds.

Like the medieval period, the modern period did not draw the attention of historians till the closing years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth. One of the pioneers in this field, specially in respect of economic history, was Romesh Chandra Dutt. Somehow the modern period did not enthuse Indian scholars till the twenties and thirties of the present century. One significant fact was that till the achievement of independence little interest was evinced by Indian scholars to study the history of the nationalist movement or socio-economic developments since the nineteenth century. It may be explained away in many ways, but the fact deserves to be noted. Till independence the historians' interest, so far as the modern period was concerned, was confined to political, constitutional and administrative history and, to a very limited extent, economic history.

Another significant fact is that not till the forties of the present century did the Indian historians think of undertaking a multi-volumed history of India incorporating the results of researches in different fields till that time. Interestingly, of the three ambitious projects undertaken about the same time, only one, edited by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, has actually been completed. About the other two, there is every reason to feel sceptical about the ultimate result.

Since the papers on the selected historians included in this volume are pretty well detailed, it is not necessary at this stage to make anything more than the briefest reference to some of the most prominent among the number. Our account, most appropriately, opens with Raja Rajendra Lal Mitra (1822-91), not only for his seniority in age but for his pioneering and outstanding contributions in the field of Indology. He is a shining example of how early Indian scholars could quickly imbibe Western historical ideas and methodology and how, working on their own, they could carry the bounds of knowledge much further than the early Western explorers. Rakhaldas Bandyopadhyaya is noteworthy not only as the real discoverer of Mohenjodaro but also as an eminent historical writer. The

two Bhandarkars, R. G. and D. R., have also built up a special *niche* for themselves among the pioneer Indologists. Hemchandra Roy Choudhury, coming later than the early pioneers, made the most solid contribution, yet unbeaten, on the political history of ancient India. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar is justly acclaimed as the pioneer worker on South Indian History. K. P. Jayaswal's historical eminence has been somewhat eclipsed by the impression, not unmerited, that he was the champion of the ultra-nationalist school of Indian history. Ghulam Yazdani will remain immortal for his Volumes on Ajanta and Ellora. P. C. Bagchi is included in the volume for his interest, quite rare at the time among Indian scholars, in India's contacts with other Asian countries. Unfortunately, the school he built at Santiniketan languished soon after his death. Kosambi, a person of versatile interest, has been specially included not only as the chief and ablest exponent of the Marxian school of Indian history (far above the puny figures who trot about to-day) but also for his brilliant style of writing. Radha Kumud Mukherjee's interest was chiefly in India's early maritime activities, and, according to some, he may be put in the category of the nationalist school, although not of the same kind as Jayaswal.

The medieval section opens with the outstanding contribution of Sir Jadunath Sarkar, who, perhaps more than any other Indian historians, was the founder of an important school of medieval historiography. The largeness of his canvas, the meticulous care with which he collected his material and sifted his evidence, and the objectivity of his judgment (not unoften antagonising partisans of both sides)—all mark him out as the historian *par excellence*. In the medieval section we have included Sir Shafaat Ahmed Khan, whose actual writings were not equal to the lofty ideals of historiography held out by him in his Presidential Address at the Indian History Congress (1935). We have also included Dr. Bal Krishna for his first study of India's commercial relations in the medieval period. Some people may feel disappointed that we have not included Professor Mohammad Habib, but on careful consideration we felt that his contribution was not of any remarkable kind. He just shot into prominence temporarily for, although being a Muslim, he had the courage and frankness to say that Mahmud of Ghazni was a foreigner. To a Muslim scholar of the twentieth century it may be a very bold statement, but to any student of Indian history it is just the barest truth.

In the next section dealing with Regional History, we have started with the historians of Maharashtra, who have in fact done a much better job of it than historians of other regions. The names include M. G. Ranade, K. T. Telang, V. K. Rajwade, V. V. Khare, D. B. Parasnis and G. S. Sardesai. Among the historians of medieval Maharashtra are included two non-Maharashtrians also—Dr. Bal Krishna and Dr. S. N. Sen. Next to Maharashtra, the best served is the history of the Punjab. Although Latif, the pioneer, is most superficial and hardly reliable, the contributions of

Dr. Indubhusan Banerjee and of Dr. Sita Ram Kohli are certainly of an outstanding character. Their work is being ably continued by the Punjab Historical Society. Rajasthan produced two remarkable historians—Kaviraj Shyamaldas and Gaurishankar Ojha—whose special merit is that they wrote in Hindi. Gujarat, on the other hand, was not that well served and only two names have been included—K. M. Jhaveri and D. K. Shastri.

In the modern section which did not really attract the attention of Indian historians till the twenties of the present century, with some rare exceptions, like R. C. Dutt, we have included R. C. Dutt mainly for his pioneering work in economic history, Surendra Nath Sen mainly for his work on the Revolt of 1857, C. S. Srinivasachari for his work on Arcot and Anglo-French Conflict, K. P. Padmanabha Menon for his pioneering history of Kerala, Pandurang Pissurlencar for his work on the Goa Archives and K. M. Panikkar, the scholar-administrator-diplomat, who has created more sensation in the Western world by his *Asia and Western Dominance* than any other Indian historian.

This brief review of the names included in the present volume, does not, of course, give an adequate idea of the extent and value of their contributions in their respective fields of interest, or the areas left uncovered, or the limitations of their views and methodology. But taking an overall stock of the situation, it must be admitted that so far as ancient Indian history is concerned, the contributions have been not only extensive in area and character but also of a remarkably high degree of originality. The same cannot be said of medieval history, although in the field of regional history much fine spadework has been done which will make the task of future historians much easier. In the field of modern history no co-ordinated attempt has been made to give a complete picture of all aspects of India's developments since the middle of the eighteenth century. Most of the work done has been in the form of University doctoral dissertations on topics chosen at random. The only example of co-ordinated work is the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Series, thanks mainly to the brilliant editorship of the doyen of Indian historians, Dr. R. C. Majumdar.

In assessing the work of these early Indian historians, it must be said to their credit that, in spite of the limitations of their age and social and political ideas, most of them had imbibed Western historical concepts and applied methodology prevalent at the time. Few of them were influenced by personal, communal or nationalist bias. On the other hand, they strove as far as possible to follow the scientific approach and to seek an objectivity which any professional historian should covet. Another thing in their favour, specially as against foreign scholars who had started pioneering studies in Indian history and culture. The Indian historians had the decided advantage of the knowledge of Indian languages and could thus utilise source -material which was not open to foreign scholars. It only proves the age-old

proverb that a country's history can be best written only by its own nationals. There may be just one or two rare exceptions, but the above represents the real truth.

The present volume is, in a way, the first of its kind in tracing the development of Indian historiography during the first hundred years since the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1956 a Conference was held at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London dealing, in its own way, with the development of Indian Historiography since the time of the old Sanskrit literature to recent trends in historical writings in Urdu. The volume, which was published in 1961 under the title of *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, is no doubt quite useful in its own way, dealing specially with some selected topics of Indian historiography. But our present volume, as one can quite see for oneself, is based on an entirely different pattern. It seeks to study the development of historiography in modern India only through the concrete writings of some selected historians who may be taken as representatives of their respective fields of interest. If it is to be compared to any similar work on the subject, it comes nearer to Gooch's *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*.

In the Introduction (p. 3) of *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, the editor has significantly remarked: "Historians of the peoples of the sub-continent have in the past operated rather like isolated guerrilla fighters in a jungle, often performing feats of individual brilliance, but lacking discipline and only vaguely aware of the part they should play in a general campaign. The papers presented in this Conference have enabled us for the first time to survey the size and nature of the jungle itself, to establish and affirm the nature of our common discipline and to cut a few broad paths along which we may move with more certainty, direction and co-operation." It is, no doubt, usual for the organisers of a Conference to feel very complacent about the results of their work and about its impact on future development. Unfortunately, they forgot that Indian historians had been meeting regularly in Annual Conferences since 1935 to discuss their common professional problems.

In the same page of the Introduction, there is another curious editorial note: "Above all we have come to appreciate that in their urgent task of creating a stronger sense of historical consciousness the new nations of the sub-continent will need more trained historians, and that in the thin years immediately ahead...it is the primary responsibility of historians and University Departments of History in Western countries to help to train and to encourage and support their Indian, Pakistani and Ceylonese colleagues." It is undoubtedly a very generous gesture and we ought to feel grateful for it. But in view of the development of Indian historiography in the first hundred years, one may reasonably feel doubtful whether it would be necessary in future to depend very much on getting our young historians

trained in British institutions of Oriental Studies. By this time, except in certain fields of the history of countries other than India, our young historians can quite proceed on their own, following the track laid down by the early pioneers.

After having dealt with the salient trends in the first hundred years of Indian historiography, it would not be quite out of place here to refer briefly to recent trends, specially since independence. One general, but very significant, trend is the conscious orientation of Indian historical studies to Central and West Asia and away from South East Asia or East Asia. The move is partly 'officially' inspired and the camouflage is so thin as to hardly serve as a cover of any kind. India's connection with South East Asia or East Asia, belonging to the ancient period and describing the expansion of Indian culture to these areas, is an unpalatable thing to many of the *soi-disant* 'progressives' in this country. Many of them take their cue from a British Oriental institution that any reference to Indian culture in Java or Cambodia is strongly resented by the local people. It, however, escapes their attention that, on the same analogy, any reference to Persian influence in medieval India is likely to be resented by many in India to-day. The real matter is that these 'progressives' are out to establish the 'plural' character of Indian society, and in that 'plurality' they include only two elements—Indian and Central and West Asian. The motive is clear and need not be dilated upon.

The next significant trend in recent historiography is the attempt at new interpretations of developments and personalities in Indian history, not based on new findings or evidence but on the application of ill-digested and irrelevant Marxian principles. That explains the recent attempts at finding socialistic trends in Ashokan reign or proletarian reaction as the basis of a new religion like Buddhism. These attempts are, no doubt, very 'saucy' for the contemporary 'progressive' elements, but in the sum total they add practically nothing to the existing stock of knowledge.

The third significant trend in recent historiography is the frantic, but futile, attempt made to give a new colouring to the policies of the medieval rulers and their governments. The lead is taken mainly by a certain well-known centre of medieval history where monographs and papers are continuously produced to show that none of the medieval foreign rulers was actually motivated by religious considerations, but that all their actions *vis-à-vis* the non-Muslims in this country were prompted wholly by political considerations. It is rather amusing that any criticism of a medieval Muslim ruler is considered as a blow to the currently desired secular ideal of the Indian State. On the same analogy, any criticism of a British administrator in pre-independence days should be treated as a blow against the secular ideal of the Indian State, since there are many Indians to-day who profess the same religion, namely, Christianity, as the old British administrator.

One most glaring truth, although quite unpalatable to some on contemporary political grounds, is that 99.9% of Indian Muslims to-day have the same historical relation with Akbar or Aurangzeb as an Indian Christian to-day has with Dalhousie or Curzon. If an attack on Dalhousie or Curzon does not in the least hurt the feelings of an Indian Christian, there is absolutely no reason why an attack on Alauddin Khalji or Aurangzeb should hurt the feelings of any Indian Muslim to-day, who has the same relationship with the medieval foreign rulers. We can only hope that in the long run these attempts will evoke nothing but contempt from serious students of Indian history who are not obsessed with the idea that the majority (or even 5%) of Indian Muslims come from Central or Western Asia, and that the present Indian society is 'plural' ethnologically only in the sense of a combination of Hindus as original Indians and Muslims coming from Central or Western Asia.

Another significant trend in recent historiography is the intervention of the State in writing history and in the colossal expansion of research facilities in history offered by a large number of fund-granting agencies under Government sponsorship. The Universities, the U.G.C., the Indian Council of Social Sciences Research, the Indian Council of Historical Research, the Indian Institute of Advanced Study and a host of other bodies, all compete with one another in offering research scholarships, fellowships and other grants. In fact, there are more research grants now available than those willing (not to say deserving) to take them. It is not a rare spectacle when the same person is awarded grants for two or more projects at the same time. Things were different fifty years ago when research was considered as mainly an individual's own concern. To-day the State has stepped in in a massive way, and while primary education is languishing for want of funds there is no dearth of money for research projects.

Two consequences are noticeable. First, there is not much of co-ordination among the different fund-granting organisations about the areas to be covered or given priority. Secondly, through the ICSSR and the ICHR there is a very conscious effort made to promote what may be called Government-approved historiography, or, to put it rather bluntly, to put in print and publicise through official agencies the historical views of those in authority at the moment. Just a cursory glance at the list of research projects undertaken or approved by the ICSSR and the ICHR will bear out this unpalatable truth. We would humbly make two suggestions in this connection. First, mere squandering of money does not lead to better research results. More important is the right type of human material which cannot be multiplied overnight, as soon as the Minister thinks he has to make a big noise. Second, history made to order by Government agencies (call them autonomous, semi-autonomous, or what you will) is only of ephemeral interest and will not be treated as significant contributions to

historical studies by anybody even inside the small circle of those who profit by the system.

The present volume has, it is hoped, served one useful purpose, namely, to bring out the noble heritage of the historian's profession during the first hundred years of its development. This is not to say that the early historians did not have their limitations regarding the area covered, the methodology applied and the general approach followed. The papers themselves in this volume have brought out in no unsparing terms the limitations of the early historians. But when all is said, it must be admitted in fairness to the vast majority of these historians, that they followed scrupulously the scientific canons of historiography prevalent at the time in the West, that they never deliberately distorted the truth and that the limitations they suffered from were the limitations of the age in which they lived. It is hardly fair to call them back-dates and working in narrow grooves, as some of the *soi-disant* 'progressives' of recent days are inclined to call them; but their solid contributions to historical knowledge have been and will be admiringly appreciated by those who know better. Another objective of the present volume is to enable the young historians to know the glorious and independent tradition of their profession, so as to be able to resist the onslaughts on that tradition of independence by the present political parties which have their own views on history and want to make history a handmaid of what they want the future Indian society to be. As members of the profession, it must be our constant endeavour to resist such attacks or cajolery and remain true to our devotion to Clio. Minister or no Minister, Governmental favour or displeasure, a historian has allegiance only to his own profession which aims at seeking the truth, bitter or sweet, whatever it may be.

I take this opportunity to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Ramesh Chandra Majumdar who was to have presided over the Sixth Annual Conference of the Institute, held at Srinagar in October 1968. Although he could not attend the Conference on account of inclement weather, he had sent us his learned Presidential Address, dealing with the evolution of Indian historiography, which we are publishing in the present volume as a most appropriate Introduction.

We are also grateful to the Contributors of papers, whose kind co-operation has rendered this publication possible. I am thankful to Dr. Bimal Kanti Majumdar (Jadavpur University), Dr. Amitabha Mukherjee (Jadavpur University), Dr. Kalyan Kumar Das Gupta (Calcutta University), and Dr. Prashanto Kumar Chatterjee (Burdwan University) for helping me ungrudgingly in editing the papers. My thanks are also due to Miss Subrata Ghosh and Miss Minati Bhattacharyya for the invaluable

help they have rendered in the preparation of the volume. Finally, I am thankful to Shri Biram Mukherjea for seeing the volume through the press and to Shri P. K. Ghosh of the Eastend Printers for his personal care and attention in supervising the printing work.

Calcutta, 1 May, 1973 S. P. SEN

PREFACE TO THE REPRINTED EDITION

IT IS a matter of great satisfaction that the first edition of the volume was very well received in academic circles not only in India but also abroad. This was the only book available for students of the History of Indian Historiography. Specially for students of Historical Methodology it was an essential volume. Many Universities in India have now included in their Post-Graduate Syllabus a paper on Historiography and Historical Methodology. Hence when the first edition of the volume ran out in less than two years time we felt it necessary to bring out immediately a reprinted edition to meet the growing demand from advanced students of History.

One thing must be clearly stated—it is not a revised edition with additional chapters or major alterations but only a reprinted edition of the old volume. The names included in the first edition of the volume are still the most important ones in the History of Indian Historiography. Since we are not including any living Historian, we did not feel it necessary to add new names in the Present edition. As we stated in the Preface to the first edition, our selection of names may not please everybody. There are some who may question the propriety of including some names or of excluding some other names. All that we can say in this connection is that we have taken all possible care in the selection of names and that the present list includes not only all the eminent Historians but also represents all the different schools of Historiography.

I am thankful to Shri Biram Mukherjea for seeing the volume through the press and to Shri Pradip Kumar Chatterjee of the Eton Press for his personal care and attention in supervising the printing work.

Calcutta, 1st September, 1976. S. P. SEN

INDIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY: SOME RECENT TRENDS

Dr. R. C. Majumdar

I am fully conscious of the great honour you have done me by asking me to preside over the assembly of historians representing the different regions of our country and I thank you for the same. I am happy to be able to accept your kind invitation, for this may be the last occasion on which I shall have the pleasure and privilege to meet the distinguished fellow -workers in a branch of study which has been my first as well as my last love, and of which I have been a faithful and devoted worker for more than half a century. I have passed the normal span of life—three score years and ten—by nearly a decade, and I cannot reasonably expect to attend any more meeting of this kind, howsoever I might like to do it. So you can take it as my farewell address to you all, many of whom I have met year after year in the not very remote past in assemblies of this kind. An old man is fond of recounting his personal reminiscences, and a student of history feels a special interest in tracing the origin of institutions. Both these instincts induce me to refer to the early history of the assemblies of the type which have brought us all together, particularly as I may claim to be one of the very few, alive to-day, who were associated with all of them from the very beginning. My mind flies back to the year 1919 which saw the first meeting of the All-India Oriental Conference at Poona, presided over by the doyen of Indian historians, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar. It was not, however, a meeting exclusively of historians, as everything oriental, like literature, came within its scope, and so far as history was concerned its interest was confined mostly to Ancient India, and to a much lesser extent, to Medieval India. So far as Modern India was concerned, it came within the scope of another institution, Historical Records Commission, also founded in the same year, 1919. It was not, however, a general gathering of historians, but more or less an official body consisting of the Secretary for Education, Government of India, as the Chairman, seven members nominated by the Government and about fifty members representing States, Universities and other institutions. Its scope was also limited to a discussion of records, mostly of the British period.

Then after an interval of eighteen years came the Indian History Congress which was originally intended to supplement the Oriental Confer-

---

Presidential Address at the Sixth Annual Conference of the Institute of Historical Studies held at Srinagar (Kashmir) in October. 1968.

ence by confining its activities to Modern History. But soon the scope was widened to embrace Indian history as a whole, and it thus became the first and only gathering exclusively of scholars interested in Indian history. The Institute of Historical Studies, under whose auspices we meet here to-day, was established in 1961, and is thus the youngest of the All-India organisations devoted to the study of the history of India. Though following in the footsteps of the Indian History Congress and having many features in common, it has in some respects chalked out a new path. It is necessary for the future development of both, that we, the students of history who have met here to-day, should have a clear conception of some of the innovations or improvements introduced by this young institution. In the first place, its regular activities are not confined to annual sessions like the Indian History Congress, but there are arrangements for Discussion Meetings, of which nearly twenty are held every year, and distinguished scholars from all over India are invited to address them. Secondly, it issues a quarterly journal, the *Quarterly Review of Historical Studies*, which not only contains scholarly articles of permanent value, but also diverse information regarding historical research in different Universities and Research Centres. Thirdly, it has a permanent home, which maintains a good library and a Research Service Bureau to help research workers in India and abroad.

The Indian History Congress still lacks these things. Attempts were made from time to time to introduce these features, but without success, and though it is somewhat unusual to refer to individual efforts in such matters, I cannot resist the temptation of offering my personal thanks and perhaps also of members present here, to Dr. S. P. Sen, the young and energetic Director of the Institute.

In common with the Indian History Congress, which has undertaken to write the Comprehensive History of India, the Institute has taken up the big project of the Dictionary of National Biography. Both are in the formative stage, and we can only hope that they will be successfully accomplished, and that the Institute will carry out its project in much less time than the Congress has already taken.

In addition to its big project the Institute has three other publications to its credit, which are of great historical value.

When the Institute was first started, it was regarded, not unnaturally, as a rival body to the Indian History Congress, and there was apprehension in the minds of many that an unhealthy rivalry might produce more evil than good. That apprehension is passing away, and let us all hope that a healthy rivalry in future would do good to both and mark a steady progress in the historical studies in India.

This is not a mere pious platitude on my part, but I seriously think that historical studies in India need careful watch, supervision and guidance from All-India organisations like the Indian History Congress and the Institute of Historical Studies. It is my belief—I hope it may prove wrong

—that the end of British rule has led to a steady deterioration in that critical method of historical studies which we Indians learnt from our contact with the West during the last half of the nineteenth and the first half of the present century. The first item in the Aims and Objects of the Institute of Historical Studies is, among others, to "analyse the recent trends in the development of historical studies and to suggest means for the improvement of the present position." Whether this was deliberately laid down owing to a realisation or premonition of the evils that are growing up in our historical studies, I cannot say, but I have not the least doubt that the fulfilment of this object represents the most important service that an All-India historical organisation may render to-day. I need not, therefore, offer any apology for dealing with this subject at some length and frankly state my opinion for whatever it is worth.

In the first place, I think we are gradually losing sight of the fundamental object and principles of writing history and a lot of confusion of ideas has crept in on this subject. I have no doubt in my mind that the universally accepted idea which we imbibed at the beginning of this century is that history must be regarded as an eternal quest for truth. This is the fundamental basis—the *raison d'être* of the study of history—everything else that may be urged on this behalf being only secondary and subordinate to it. This was laid down as the first principle of history by both Niebuhr and Ranke, the two great commanding figures in modern Historiography. "In laying down the pen," wrote Niebuhr, "we must be able to say in the sight of God, 'I have not knowingly nor without earnest investigation written anything which is not true.'"

Ranke supplemented it by the following observation:

"History has had assigned to it the task of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of the ages to come. To such lofty functions this work does not aspire. Its aim is merely to show what actually occurred."

I take all this to mean that truth, nothing but the truth and the whole truth as far as it may be ascertained, should form the steel-frame of history, on which you may build a structure according to different plans or patterns.

Moral judgment as well as various inferences are welcome and even necessary, only when the facts are established with a scrupulous regard for truth alone, without any influence of preconceived judgment, and afford sufficient materials for forming a judgment.

Standing on the soil of Kashmir I cannot forget that Kalhana, the historian of this land, the great and the only real historian that ancient India can boast of, had also preached this high ideal of history. He held that the true historian must keep a detached mind and like a judge should recount events after having discarded bias and prejudice (v. 7). This lofty ideal was held up as a historian's motto by the greatest historian of modern India, Sir Jadunath Sarkar. The following is a literal translation of a passage in his Presidential Address in Bengali in the year 1915: "I would not care

ence by confining its activities to Modern History. But soon the scope was widened to embrace Indian history as a whole, and it thus became the first and only gathering exclusively of scholars interested in Indian history. The Institute of Historical Studies, under whose auspices we meet here to-day, was established in 1961, and is thus the youngest of the All-India organisations devoted to the study of the history of India. Though following in the footsteps of the Indian History Congress and having many features in common, it has in some respects chalked out a new path. It is necessary for the future development of both, that we, the students of history who have met here to-day, should have a clear conception of some of the innovations or improvements introduced by this young institution. In the first place, its regular activities are not confined to annual sessions like the Indian History Congress, but there are arrangements for Discussion Meetings, of which nearly twenty are held every year, and distinguished scholars from all over India are invited to address them. Secondly, it issues a quarterly journal, the *Quarterly Review of Historical Studies,* which not only contains scholarly articles of permanent value, but also diverse information regarding historical research in different Universities and Research Centres. Thirdly, it has a permanent home, which maintains a good library and a Research Service Bureau to help research workers in India and abroad.

The Indian History Congress still lacks these things. Attempts were made from time to time to introduce these features, but without success, and though it is somewhat unusual to refer to individual efforts in such matters, I cannot resist the temptation of offering my personal thanks and perhaps also of members present here, to Dr. S. P. Sen, the young and energetic Director of the Institute.

In common with the Indian History Congress, which has undertaken to write the Comprehensive History of India, the Institute has taken up the big project of the Dictionary of National Biography. Both are in the formative stage, and we can only hope that they will be successfully accomplished, and that the Institute will carry out its project in much less time than the Congress has already taken.

In addition to its big project the Institute has three other publications to its credit, which are of great historical value.

When the Institute was first started, it was regarded, not unnaturally, as a rival body to the Indian History Congress, and there was apprehension in the minds of many that an unhealthy rivalry might produce more evil than good. That apprehension is passing away, and let us all hope that a healthy rivalry in future would do good to both and mark a steady progress in the historical studies in India.

This is not a mere pious platitude on my part, but I seriously think that historical studies in India need careful watch, supervision and guidance from All-India organisations like the Indian History Congress and the Institute of Historical Studies. It is my belief—I hope it may prove wrong

—that the end of British rule has led to a steady deterioration in that critical method of historical studies which we Indians learnt from our contact with the West during the last half of the nineteenth and the first half of the present century. The first item in the Aims and Objects of the Institute of Historical Studies is, among others, to "analyse the recent trends in the development of historical studies and to suggest means for the improvement of the present position." Whether this was deliberately laid down owing to a realisation or premonition of the evils that are growing up in our historical studies, I cannot say, but I have not the least doubt that the fulfilment of this object represents the most important service that an All-India historical organisation may render to-day. I need not, therefore, offer any apology for dealing with this subject at some length and frankly state my opinion for whatever it is worth.

In the first place, I think we are gradually losing sight of the fundamental object and principles of writing history and a lot of confusion of ideas has crept in on this subject. I have no doubt in my mind that the universally accepted idea which we imbibed at the beginning of this century is that history must be regarded as an eternal quest for truth. This is the fundamental basis—the *raison d'être* of the study of history—everything else that may be urged on this behalf being only secondary and subordinate to it. This was laid down as the first principle of history by both Niebuhr and Ranke, the two great commanding figures in modern Historiography. "In laying down the pen," wrote Niebuhr, "we must be able to say in the sight of God, 'I have not knowingly nor without earnest investigation written anything which is not true.'"

Ranke supplemented it by the following observation:

"History has had assigned to it the task of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of the ages to come. To such lofty functions this work does not aspire. Its aim is merely to show what actually occurred."

I take all this to mean that truth, nothing but the truth and the whole truth as far as it may be ascertained, should form the steel-frame of history, on which you may build a structure according to different plans or patterns.

Moral judgment as well as various inferences are welcome and even necessary, only when the facts are established with a scrupulous regard for truth alone, without any influence of preconceived judgment, and afford sufficient materials for forming a judgment.

Standing on the soil of Kashmir I cannot forget that Kalhana, the historian of this land, the great and the only real historian that ancient India can boast of, had also preached this high ideal of history. He held that the true historian must keep a detached mind and like a judge should recount events after having discarded bias and prejudice (v. 7). This lofty ideal was held up as a historian's motto by the greatest historian of modern India, Sir Jadunath Sarkar. The following is a literal translation of a passage in his Presidential Address in Bengali in the year 1915: "I would not care

whether truth is pleasant or unpleasant, and in consonance with or opposed to current views. I would not mind in the least whether truth is or is not a blow to the glory of my country. If necessary, I shall bear in patience the ridicule and slander of friends and society for the sake of preaching truth. But still I shall seek truth, understand truth and accept truth. This should be the firm resolve of a historian."

Later, when Dr. Rajendra Prasad launched a scheme to write a comprehensive national history of India on a co-operative basis and requested Jadunath to become its Chief Editor, Jadunath wrote to him on 19 November, 1937, "National history, like every other history worthy of the name and deserving to endure, must be true as regards the facts and reasonable in the interpretation of them. It will be national not in the sense that it will try to suppress or whitewash everything in our country's past that is disgraceful, but because it will admit them and at the same time point out that there were other and nobler aspects in the stages of our nation's evolution which offset the former.... In this task the historian must be a judge. He will not suppress any defect of the national character, but add to his portraiture those higher qualities which, taken together with the former, help to constitute the entire individual."

In his reply to the above, dated 22nd November, 1937, Dr. Rajendra Prasad wrote: "I entirely agree with you that no history is worth the name which suppresses or distorts facts. A historian who purposely does so under the impression that he thereby does good to his native country really harms it in the end. Much more so in the case of a country like ours which has suffered much on account of its national defects, and which must know and understand them to be able to remedy them."

I solemnly hope and pray that these words would be remembered by the present and future generations of historians, for I see great dangers lurking ahead. I was reading recently a book entitled *Contemporary History in the Soviet Mirror,* published in 1964. I was struck by many passages, a few of which I quote at random.

"The present official line in historiography is, if anything, even more militantly partisan than it was in Stalin's day."

"The Soviet politicians have a narrow and utilitarian view of the functions of scholarship." "Nothing could be more destructive of historical scholarship than the claim that the party is the repository of supreme wisdom.... In the Soviet Union today historians, like everyone else, are required to believe that, by some mysterious process unfathomable to ordinary mortal, the party has been infallible." "The partisan approach to history prevents the observer from recognising the sanctity of objective facts and requires him where necessary to deny the evidence of his senses; for there are occasions when he must subordinate his own personal concept of truth to that held by individual or group of individuals namely the party" (p. 16). How far these allegations are true, I cannot say, but it would be

obvious to most people that these symptoms constitute dangerous impediments to the growth of historiography. What is less obvious is that our country, dominated by party feelings, is rapidly moving towards the same goal.

I know from personal experience how the Government of India has sought to utilise history for the spread of ideas which they have elevated to the rank of national policy to their own satisfaction. They are not willing to tolerate any history which mentions facts incompatible with their ideas of national integration and solidarity. They do not inquire whether the facts stated are true, or views expressed are reasonable deductions from facts, but condemn outright any historical writings which in their opinion are likely to go against national integration and their views about such things as eternal Hindu-Muslim fraternity, the non-existence of separate Hindu and Muslim cultures, and their fusion into one Indian culture, etc. etc. I mention these particular instances, as I am in a position to substantiate my charge by documentary evidence, but reference may be made to many other illustrations, less susceptible to positive evidence. All these are done in the name of national policy which is at best the policy of a political party. But it violates the only national policy, which cannot be challenged by any party, namely, "Truth shall prevail," the motto engraved on our national emblem.

Unfortunately, it is not the Government alone that violates the true ideals of history as upheld by Niebuhr, Ranke, Sir Jadunath Sarkar and a host of others who are justly regarded as creators of modern historiography.

It seems to me that during the post-Independence period, certain new trends are growing among a section of Indian historians which violate the high ideals of truth noted above. Strangely enough, those were foreseen by the great Arab historian Ibn Khaldun. He gives a long list of defects of historians which include "a very common desire to gain the favour of those of high rank, by praising them, by spreading their fame, by flattering them, by embellishing their doings and by interpreting in the most favourable way all their actions." Khaldun then justly observed that "all this gives a distorted version of historical events." This characteristic is a growing menace to historiography in modern India. This evil is enhanced by the fact that the Government, directly or indirectly, seeks to utilise history to buttress some definite ideas such as Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence, an imaginary conception of friendly relation subsisting between the two great communities, and several popular slogans evoked by the exigencies of the struggle for freedom. These have been accepted as a rich legacy by the Government, even though it practically means in many cases the sacrifice of truth, the greatest legacy which Mahatma Gandhi meant to bequeath to mankind.

For example, the cult of non-violence is an ideal devoutly to be wished for, but when some historians of India seriously maintain that this ideal

has been followed throughout the course of Indian history, one rubs his eyes with wonder, for not only are all the known facts of Indian rulers against the assumption that they were averse to war, but war has been recommended by political texts as a normal practice and sanctioned by religion through the Asvamedha sacrifice, eulogy of *digvijaya*, and of Kings who have won victory in hundred battles—*samara-sata-vijayi*.

Such distortion of history can never be excused even in the name of Mahatma Gandhi.

The net result has been that the oft-quoted phrase 'History is past politics' is likely to be substituted soon by a new phrase 'History is present politics.'

But the extent of deviation from the high ideals of history mentioned above may be better judged by the recent pronouncements made by some eminent historians. This is best illustrated by the Addresses of some General and Sectional Presidents of the Indian History Congress during the last decade.

"History," we are told in a Presidental Address, "has a mission and obligation to lead humanity to a higher ideal and nobler future. The historian cannot shirk this responsibility by hiding his head into the false dogma of objectivity, that his job is merely to chronicle the past. His task is to reveal the spirit of humanity and guide it towards self-expression." Some concrete steps are suggested for achieving this end. History, we are told, must not call to memory "ghastly aberrations of human nature, of dastardly crimes, of divisions and conflicts, of degeneration and decay, but of the higher values of life, of traditions of culture and of the nobler deeds of sacrifice and devotion to the service of humanity." In other words, history should record the spread of Buddhism by Asoka but not the horrors of the Kalinga war, carefully avoid all traces of the devastation and massacre of Mahmud of Ghazni, destruction of temples by Aurangzib, the Jallianwala-bagh massacre by General Dyer, outrages during recent communal riots, and so on. The reason for these omissions is that such things bring some "unhealthy trends which militate against the concept of international peace." We are further told that "the purpose of history is to trace the course of progress towards liberty." To crown all, it is asserted that "even facts of Indian history have to be judged by the criterion of progress towards liberty and morality."

Lack of time would not permit me to enter into a discussion on the mission and obligations of history. But I demur to the learned General President's contention that they are powerful enough to override the objectivity of history, which is a false dogma. I belong to the old school which regards objectivity as the soul of history, and though the historian's job is not merely to chronicle the past, it is his first and foremost duty to do so in the right manner. I would rather follow in the footsteps of Ranke and repeat that "my books do not aspire to such lofty functions as laid down in

the Presidential Address. Their principal object is to show what actually occurred in the past."

I would cite only another example which gives a forecast of the shape that Indian history would take in future. A President of the section II (Medieval India) of the Indian History Congress begins his address by pointing out the chief errors of Sir Henry Elliot and other Anglo-Indian writers of Medieval India. One of these is, to quote his own words, "the wholly impossible and erroneous conclusion that the Musalmans, as such, were a governing class, while the Hindus as such were the governed."

The President then refers to "India's contact with Islam which had a deep impact on the social, cultural, political and economic life of the country." The net result of this is reflected in the following successive stages in the evolution of Medieval India. First, the Turkish state of the Ilbarites; second, the Indo-Muslim state of the Khaljis and the Tughluqs and the third, the emergence of the Indian state of the Mughals. We are told that "Akbar's political outlook was an outcome of the accumulated political development inherent in the very nature of the situation." Unfortunately, nothing is said about his successors, particularly Aurangzib, though it is claimed that on account of the continuity in this cultural evolution the Mughal empire lasted longer than the whole of the Sultanate period.

I have selected extracts from the speeches of General and Sectional Presidents, because they are elected by the general body of historians and represent the élite among the modern historians of India. As such their views may be taken to represent those of at least a growing section of modern historians. I do not propose to discuss the merits or demerits of these views, but merely stress the fact that they constitute a great departure from what was conceived as the fundamental principle of true history in our younger days. As I feel very strongly that this approach to history is quite wrong, I thought it to be my duty to present my views before the coming generations of historians. It is for them to judge whether they possess any value and choose their future course accordingly. I conclude what may be described as my swan-song by saying that history, divorced from truth, does not help a nation—its future should be laid on the stable foundations of truth and not on the quicksands of falsehood however alluring it may appear at present. India is now at the cross-roads and I urge my young friends to choose carefully the path they would like to tread upon.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

CONTENTS

Page

Preface V
DR. S. P. SEN

Indian Historiography: Some Recent Trends XVII
DR. R. C. MAJUMDAR

INDIAN HISTORIANS

Ancient Period

Raja Rajendralal Mitra 1
DR. SISIR KUMAR MITRA

Rakhaldas Bandyopadhyay . . 15
DR. KALYAN KUMAR DAS GUPTA

R. G. Bhandarkar . . 27
DR. A. D. PUSALKAR

D. R. Bhandarkar . . 49
DR. A. N. LAHIRI

S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar . . 60
DR. G. S. DIKSHIT

Radha Kumud Mookerji . . 69
DR. HARI SHANKAR SRIVASTAVA

Kashi Prasad Jayaswal . . 81
DR. B. P. SINHA

Hem Chandra Raychaudhuri . . 95
DR. B. K. MAJUMDAR

Prabodh Chandra Bagchi . . 105
DR. H. P. CHAKRAVORTI

Ghulam Yazdani . . 116
DR. H. K. SHERWANI

D. D. Kosambi . . 121
DWIJENDRA NARAYAN JHA

Page

Medieval Period

Sir Jadunath Sarkar . . 133
DR. A. L. SRIVASTAVA

Sir Shafaat Ahmad Khan . . 146
DR. BISHESHWAR PRASAD

Dr. Bal Krishna . . 158
DR. A. G. PAWAR

Maharashtra

M. G. Ranade . . 165
DR. V. G. HATALKAR

Kashinath Trimbak Telang . . 185
DR. L. B. KENY

Vishwanath Kashinath Rajwade . . 200
G. H. KHARE

Dattatray Balwant Parasnis . . 207
V. G. KHOBREKAR

Vasudeo Vamanshastri Khare . . 215
A. M. VAIRAT

Govind Sakharam Sardesai . . 222
DR. VASANT D. RAO

Punjab

Syad Muhammad Latif . . 235
DR. S. K. BAJAJ

Sita Ram Kohli . . 251
DR. FAUJA SINGH

Indubhusan Banerjee . . 265
DR. ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE

Rajasthan

Kaviraj Shyamaldas . . 281
DR. G. N. SHARMA

Gaurishanker Hirachand Ojha . . 291
DR. M. S. JAIN

Page

Gujarat

Krishnalal Mohanlal Jhaveri . . 305
DR. C. R. NAIK

Durgashankar K. Shastri . . 311
DR. R. N. MEHTA

Modern Period

Romesh Chandra Dutt . . 320
DR. SUNIL SEN

Sardar K. M. Panikkar . . 329
DR. TARASANKAR BANERJEE

Dr. Surendra Nath Sen . . 352
DR. ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE

C. S. Srinivasachari . . 359
DR. S. KRISHNASWAMY

K. P. Padmanabha Menon . . 371
M. G. S. NARAYANAN

P. S. S. Pissurlencar . . 385
DR. B. S. SHASTRY

BRITISH HISTORIANS

Grant Duff . . 399
DR. A. R. KULKARNI

Mark Wilks . . 413
DR. K. N. V. SASTRI

James Tod . . 416
DR. SUKUMAR BHATTACHARYYA

Joseph Davey Cunningham . . 425
DR. BAKHSHISH SINGH NIJJAR

Sir William Wilson Hunter . . 433
DR. K. K. SHARMA

INDIAN HISTORIANS

RAJA RAJENDRALAL MITRA

DR. SISIR KUMAR MITRA

(Centre of Advanced Study, Calcutta University)

RAJA RAJENDRALAL MITRA was one of those pioneer Indologists who may very well be credited with having laid the true foundations of scientific historiography in modern India.

The development of oriental studies and the evolution of an analytical methodology for historical investigations are all associated with the birth of the Asiatic Society in Calcutta in 1784. Under the inspired leadership of its founder-President, Sir William Jones, the Society for the first time made an organised effort to study the history, society and culture of India. During this time fortunately there was in Bengal a group of energetic young officers of the East India Company who gathered round the personality of Jones. While visiting different parts of the country in course of their official duties, they came to be acquainted with stray evidences of the high state of civilisation of India, which captured their imagination, and with great enthusiasm they tried not only to collect and collate those materials, but also to read between the lines, and thus attempt to reconstruct the cultural background of the people and the country that came under their domination. Their interest in Asiatic studies became so abiding that they pursued it against heavy odds, and often produced works of great interest. Among them mention may be made of Charles Wilkins, H. T. Colebrooke, Nathaniel Halhed, John Shore, Francis Gladwin, William Chambers and the Chief Justice Robert Chambers and others—all compatriots of Jones. Illuminating articles and communication on important discoveries and new ideas based on just reasoning from the best available data were contributed by them to the organ of the Society, the *Asiatick Researches*, started in 1788. Thus the seeds of modern historical scholarship came to be sown in the last quarter of the 18th century at the instance of scholars foreign to this land.

With the turn of the century, when the doors of western education were flung open to the Indians, new movements started in different fields of life as a result of the impact of new ideas, full of vitality and born of objective reasoning and scientific knowledge. The indigenous culture, heavy with age and enmeshed in rituals and superstitions, got a violent shake-up. But after the initial period of exuberance, when a modernity of an uncompromising variety raised its head, the Hindu intelligentsia regained its balance and was reawakened to rediscover their own glorious past. The dignity and pride of this discovery enabled them to seek for a

reorientation and a synthesis of the learnings of the East and the West. In fact, this movement provided a momentum to the process of critical study and restoration of the cultural heritage of India, initiated by the master-mind of Jones through the Asiatic Society. Some of the young intellectuals of Bengal now began to participate actively in modern historical investigations with significant results. Rajendralal Mitra was one of those few scholars of the mid-19th century who were profoundly inspired by the ideas and attitude of Jones, whom he had no occasion to meet personally, but whose legacy contributed in a large way to the development of his concepts of history and the methodology of its presentation.

The Mitras of Soora, an eastern suburb of Calcutta, were an old and respectable Kayastha family of West Bengal. Rajendralal was born in the ancestral residence of the family on Saturday, February 16, 1822, as the third son of Janamejaya Mitra, a cultured man of literary pursuits. Janamejaya inherited the traditional pride and dignity of olden times, but had not had means enough to provide for a high living and good education for all his children. Of his six sons, Rajendra showed signs of promise from his childhood, and his parents transferred him to the care of his childless widowed aunt at Calcutta. There he had his early schooling in English at the private school of Kshema Chandra Bose of Pathuriaghata and at the Hindu Free School of Govindachandra Bysack. Very soon he made his mark as a keen and intelligent student and gained proficiency in the English language, besides Persian, Sanskrit and Bengali.

By nature attentive and persevering, Rajendralal was a good student and in course of four years of study of medicine, not only won prizes and distinctions, but also earned the love and affection of his European teachers and of that noble Bengali patron of modern education, Dwarkanath Tagore. In recognition of his merit Dwarkanath even wanted to send him to England for higher training and to bear all expenses for the same. But the family scruples prevented Rajendralal from accepting this generous offer. Had he done so, he would surely have succeeded in the field of medicine, but in that case we would not have had the antiquarian scholar to unravel the cultural history of the motherland.

His medical studies, however, were cut short by force of circumstances, as a result of an undesirable incident at the College in May 1841, in which some of Rajendra's class-mates were alleged to have misbehaved, and he stoutly refused to disclose their identity and let down his friends. So he was forced to leave the college. This bold attitude of sticking fast to his own norms of behaviour, even at the cost of personal odium, was a permanent trait of his character, an essential ingredient for a true researcher, who would seek for truth and truth alone.

Rajendralal was not a man of passive disposition to be cowed down by calamities. In almost a challenging mood, he soon made up his mind

to study law. Within a very short time, by dint of his intellect and industry, he made sufficient headway in this new branch of study and sat for the examination. But again Fate willed otherwise. On a report of leakage of some of the papers set, the examination, in which Rajendra had been expecting a sure success, was cancelled. Thus for reasons beyond his control his student career in the fields of general education, medicine or law, was fraught with disappointments in spite of his own best efforts. Whatever it may be, his studies in different fields contributed to the development of his wide knowledge in varied subjects, which stood him in good stead in later years.

The year 1846 was a landmark in the life of Rajendralal, when he came to be associated with the Asiatic Society, as its Assistant Secretary and Librarian on a monthly salary of Rs. 100/-. The learned institution with its rich treasure of books, manuscripts and antiquities and the inspiring company of a band of devoted scholars, provided the young Rajendra with what he had been craving for all these years. The seeds of scholarship, lying dormant in him, now in this congenial climate sprouted into a healthy plant, amply making up for the deficiencies of his early education. The duties of an official of such a learned body naturally were of a diverse nature. It included the proper preservation of multifarious books and antiquities, helping the inquisitive readers and scholars in their studies, as well as keeping track of the various branches of research conducted by the members of the Society and communicated in its different sessions for accurate recording in the minutes and journals. All these functions Rajendra performed with intelligence, industry and enthusiasm. The ten years from 1846 to 1856 during which Rajendra served the Society was indeed the formative period in the life of the future Indologist, when he got substantial help, impetus and practical training in the methodology of antiquarian research. The meritorious services of this valuable officer received high encomiums from the Council of the Society at its meeting in February, 1856 on the eve of his appointment as the Director of the Wards Institution, founded by the Government for the education of the sons of the zamindars and landlords, on a monthly salary of Rs. 300/-. This office he held for the next 25 years till the Government decided to wind up the Institution in 1880, and Rajendra retired from active service on a handsome monthly pension of Rs. 500/-. All these years, however, Rajendra maintained a lively interest in the affairs of the Asiatic Society, and as one of its most energetic members, participated in the academic activities of this learned body by editing important texts in the Bibliotheca Indica Series, by publishing descriptive catalogues of manuscripts and other curiosities in the archives of the Society, by contributing new ideas in numerous illuminating papers and monographs in its journals and also by taking the most useful part in scholarly deliberations. In fact he utilised his leisure during his tenure of

Directorship of the Wards Institution devotedly in the cultivation of knowledge, and the major portion of his scholarly productions that marked him out as one of the foremost Indologists belongs to this period. It was during this period again that Rajendra served the Society in different responsible capacities, viz., as its Secretary (1857, 1865), as its Vice-President (1861-65, 1870-84, 1886-91) and even as its highest dignitary, President in 1885.

A man possessed of almost an inexhaustible fund of energy and enthusiasm, Rajendra also associated himself with all sorts of cultural activities of his time. For many years he was an active member of the Calcutta Corporation, a Fellow of the Calcutta University and the President of the Landholders' Association and it is a matter of pride indeed that each of these institutions held him in great esteem for his wise counsel and sincere services. He also served, equally sincerely, institutions like Tatvavodhini Sabha, Saraswat Samaj, Central Text Book Committee, Vernacular Literature Society, Calcutta School Book Society, Industrial Art School, etc. in different responsible capacities, He even took part in the deliberations of the second session of the Indian National Congress held in Calcutta in 1886 as the Chairman of the Reception Committee. His thought-provoking address on the occasion amply demonstrates his national consciousness and political idealism of a very high order.

In recognition of his high academic eminence and significant contribution to human knowledge the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain elected him an honorary Fellow in 1865 and the Calcutta University conferred on him its highest degree of Doctor of Laws (*Honoris causa*) in 1876. The Government also decorated him with the honorific titles of Rai Bahadur in 1877, C.I.E. in 1878 and finally Raja in 1888.

Full of years and honours, Rajendralal died in Calcutta on July 26, 1891 after a short illness.

The volume of literary and scholarly output of Rajendralal reveals his wide interest and deep erudition in a variety of subjects. His mastery of different languages like Sanskrit, Bengali, Hindi, Urdu, English, French and German, proved to be of immense benefit to him in his research ventures, and he found delight more in exploring the core material than in writing treatises like the professional historian.

The years of his directorship of the Wards Institution was the most fruitful period in his life, as the major portion of his works is assignable to this period. In attempting an appraisal of his works it may be convenient to deal with the different types separately.

(a) *Bibliographical Works*: To start with, we may refer to his works of bibliographical nature that gave him a thorough acquaintance with the core materials, like the manuscripts and other antiquities in the archives of the Society and elsewhere. He deserves credit for evolving for the first

time a pattern of descriptive catalogues that proved to be of considerable value to scholars, and in this respect he was a pioneer. As early as 1847 he was commissioned by the Society to prepare a descriptive catalogue of curiosities in the Society's collections. It was published in 1849 and was followed by a catalogue of books and maps in 1856 and vol. I of *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts* in 1877. Perhaps, in course of this work he developed a keen interest in old manuscripts—not only those collected and preserved in the archives of the Society but also of the innumerable texts scattered in different parts of the country, which he tried to bring to the notice of scholars and historians. This was almost a mission with him, and he travelled extensively in quest of such texts. Happily his efforts were successful in a large measure. He discovered a considerable number of important manuscripts, information of which were recorded in his *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* published in nine volumes from 1870-88. The activities of Rajendralal roused a feeling of consciousness in the academic circles and also in the Government quarters about the necessity of preservation of valuable documents, and we find that Rajendra's experience was utilised by the then Government as well as by other academic bodies. During 1873-78 came out *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Oudh*, in 1875, *A Report on Sanskrit Manuscripts in Native Libraries*, and in 1880, *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of H. H. Maharajah of Bikanir* as well as *A Report on the Discovery and Preservation of Ancient Manuscripts in Bengal Province*. Thus, in the field of exploring and systematically describing the old manuscripts, Rajendra rendered immense services to the cause of Indology. He realised the importance of the works of bibliographical nature, which, apparently dull, nevertheless constitute the very basis of History.

(b) *Edition of Texts*: But the most eminent contribution of Rajendra was the edition of numerous Sanskrit texts and commentaries with suitable introduction. His wide studies in different branches of Sanskrit literature endowed him with a sort of versatility that enabled him to handle Vedic and Buddhist texts with equal confidence. As early as 1849 Rajendra's attention was drawn to a newly discovered text of *Kamandakiya Nitisara*, a commentary on the political theories of Kautilya's *Arthasastra*. He began publishing it in instalments from the next year (1849) and the completed volume was brought out in the Bibliotheca Indica Series in 1884. In style and character the treatise of the time of the Imperial Guptas was somewhat of an encyclopaedic nature, dealing with—besides political concepts relating to internal administrative organisations and inter-State relations—theories governing social and economic institutions as well. By bringing out this work Rajendra opened up a valuable source of information unfolding the cultural eminence and objectivity of outlook of the ancient Indian thinkers in material affairs of life.

Besides legal literature Rajendra next took up the edition of a text relating to the cult of *Bhakti* or absolute faith as the basic factor leading to the supreme knowledge of the ultimate reality. This was the text of *Chaitanya Chandrodaya Nataka* edited in 1853, which inculcated in a dramatic form the peculiar tenets of the Bhakti school of philosophers.

The voluminous works of Rajendra in the field of Vedic studies amply illustrate his erudition and untiring industry. The Asiatic Society started its Bibliotheca Indica Series in 1847 with the principal object of editing important Vedic texts under the general editorship of Dr. Roer, who also published translations of some of them. It was Rajendralal who, with his deep knowledge of Sanskrit, ably assisted Roer in his work and also translated the *Chhandogya Upanishad* of the Sama Veda himself in 1854. The edition of this intricate text established Rajendra as a profound Vedic scholar and he pursued the work with still more patience in editing a number of *Brahmanas* and *Aranyakas* for the B. I. Series, viz:

(a) *Taittiriya Brahmana of Yajur Veda* with a commentary of Sayanacharya (1859, 1862, 1890),
(b) *Taittiriya Aranyaka* (1871),
(c) *Gopatha Brahmana* of the *Atharva Veda* (1872), and
(d) *Aitareya Aranyaka* of the *Rig Veda* (1875).

It is interesting to observe that in presenting the text Rajendralal not only displayed the utmost care of an accurate editor but also he left the stamp of his genius in analysing the work in English and arranging the Mantras *seriatim* in the table of contents for the facility of modern scholars.

Another branch of Vedic literature, the Pratisakhyas containing the system of phonology, which was distinct with each Veda, also received the attention of this great scholar. With his knowledge of the science of linguistics Rajendra undertook the work of editing the Pratisakhyas of *Krishna Yajur Veda* in 1854 and it was published together with its commentary *Tribhasyaratna* in 1871. To him also goes the credit of editing the text of *Brihad-devata of Saunaka*, containing a glossary of gods worshipped in the different hymns of the *Rig Veda*, as also myths and legends connected with them. This was published posthumously in 1892.

Rajendralal developed an interest in Indian philosophy quite early in life, and it is illustrated by his edition of the drama *Chaitanya Chandrodaya* in 1853, as already mentioned. This interest persisted even when he was engaged in Vedic studies. Later in his life when the Society undertook the publication of the text books of all the six Darsanas or philosophic schools, Rajendralal took upon himself the onerous duty of editing the *Yoga Sutras of Patanjali* which was published in 1880 along with the commentary *Rajamartanda* of Bhoja Raja. The academic value of the work was, however, greatly enhanced by the English translation of both the text and the commentary, as also by Rajendra's own contribution of a

learned commentary, in which he attempted a comparative study of the viewpoints of renowned philosophers like Vyasa, Vijnana Bhikshu, and Vachaspati Mishra. Thus he set a standard for critical examination of the theories enunciated by ancient logicians in the light of other extant thought-currents, in order that modern scholars may appreciate in proper perspective the growth and development of Indian culture.

Besides the Vedas and Darsanas, the Puranas constitute an important branch of Sanskrit literature from the religious and social point of view. Of the four major Puranas brought out by the Asiatic Society in its B. I. Series, Rajendralal had been commissioned to edit two, *the Agni Purana* and the *Vayu Purana*, which were published in different fascicules between 1870 and 1886. In this case too, besides editing the text Rajendra appended an exhaustive study of the works, fully describing their subject matter.

Rajendra's genius did not keep him confined to the domain of Sanskrit literature only. His searching attention was directed also to Buddhist texts written in Pali and Prakrit. It was in the second quarter of the nineteenth century that B. H. Hodgson discovered a large number of Sanskrit texts on northern Buddhism in Nepal. They were written in a hybrid language, a mixed form of Sanskrit and Prakrit. Rajendra became curious about it and after a painstaking study, edited the text *Lalitavistara* in the B. I. Series in 1853. It was composed in the Gatha dialect, a form of Prakrit but closely akin to Sanskrit. Later in 1888 he edited the famous Buddhist text of *Ashtasahasrika Prajnaparamita*. But what is more, Rajendra compiled a descriptive account of the whole collection of Hodgson's manuscripts, presented to the Asiatic Society, under the title *Sanskrit Buddhist Literature in Nepal*. This is a work of outstanding importance, still profitably used by scholars in the field.

It was thus Rajendra devoted practically his whole life to bringing out a series of source books, so essential for the proper appreciation of the basic factors of Indian cultural history. Because of his efforts, later historians could build up the superstructure of Indian cultural heritage.

(c) *Historical Works*: Rajendra's personal contribution to the field of historical research was none the less significant. With his keen historical sense he realised the futility, rather the impossibility, of attempting a connected account of India's past in the absence of reliable evidences. He devoted his energies, therefore, in examining the archaeological and archival materials that he could lay hands on, and in sifting the grain from the chaff with the absolute detachment of a seeker of truth. His numerous articles in the different volumes of the proceedings and transactions and journals of the Society bear ample testimony to his untiring enthusiasm and outstanding ability in accurately screening the evidences for the extraction of their historical value. The Centenary Volume of

the Society (1884) contains a list of as many as 114 articles on a variety of topics—archaeology, literature, philosophy, and so on, to the credit of Rajendralal. It is, however, worth mentioning that more than half of them belong to the category of history, political as well as cultural, based on data provided by epigraphic findings of the time. A selection of these essays was compiled and published in 1881 in two volumes under the title *The Indo-Aryans*.

As early as 1848, while working in the Asiatic Society, Rajendralal edited an inscription found at Vijaya Mandir, Udaypur, throwing light on the dynasty of Mahodaya (Kanauj) ruling between the 8th and 10th century A.D. The manner of his exposition of the historical material in the paper concerned established him as a prominent historical researcher of his time. There is no doubt about the fact that his wide reading in Sanskrit literature, blended with his keen sense of historical perspective, provided him with the best possible equipment for the unfolding of the significance of phrases and allusions used in the inscriptions by the Court poets. In course of his editions of inscriptions belonging to the Gahadavalas of Kanauj, Chandellas of Bundelkhund, Kacchapaghatas of Gwalior, Rajendra critically discussed their chronology and other related problems (*J.A.S.B.*, 1865, 1873, 1878). Similarly the discovery of the Bhagalpur inscription at Narayanapala gave him the opportunity for a reconsideration of the Pala chronology. Again, the whole subject on the history of the Sena dynasty was carefully examined by him in two papers in the Journal in 1865 and 1878. Determination of the initial years of the Saka era and Gupta era posed almost baffling propositions to scholars like Prinsep, Masson, Cunningham and Hall. In both the cases Rajendra contributed substantially by providing true reading of the phraseology of the epigraphic texts.

Investigations of no less, but with equally important results were carried on by Rajendra in the field of Numismatic studies. He wrote a number of papers describing the technicalities of different coin types of ancient India with the accuracy of an expert (namely, Muhammdpur, Jessore coins, 1852, Cooch Behar silver coins, 1863, Kuninda coins, 1875, and Arakan coins; 1878-80).

It is indeed interesting to observe that epigraphy and numismatic or, for that matter, dynastic and chronological problems alone could not limit Rajendra's historical studies. He was a believer in the theory of reconstruction of history 'from the bottom up', and so we get from his facile pen informative and instructive essays dealing with controversial and social problems like 'Beef in ancient India' and 'Spirituous drinks in ancient India', and the like. In the latter, the learned author traced the history of spirituous drinks in India from the time of the Vedic Aryans whom he described as a spirituous drinking race, who not only consumed Soma and other strong spirits themselves but also offered

them to their gods through different sacrifices. Rajendra quoted exhaustively from texts to show how due to the growth of a feeling of revulsion, spiritual threats were held out by legal writers in later times, but almost to no effect, as the practice persisted in the society throughout the historical period.

In the field of art and architecture Rajendra's contributions are of immeasurable value. As early as 1862 he came out with a detailed exposition of some Graeco-Bactrian relics from Rawalpindi followed by other similarly interesting papers on Greek sculpture in Mathura, representation of foreigners in Ajanta frescos, etc., but his *magnum opus* in this branch of cultural history was *Antiquities of Orissa,* published in two big volumes in 1875 and 1888. This enduring work speaks eloquently of Rajendra's intensive study of the archaeological remains of India, particularly the temples and sculptures of Orissa, for which he personally conducted exploratory operations during 1868-1869. Divided into two parts, the work discusses the nature and character of the objects noticed and detailed descriptions of those objects, including the peculiarities of individual relics. Excellent line drawings and lithographic illustrations of different elements of the temple complex heightens the importance of the work as a source book for history, art and architecture of Orissa. To this the learned author appended a critical study on the architectural, religious and social history of Orissa on the basis of an objective interpretation of sculptural materials, which must have been influenced by the prevailing social conditions and current religious speculations. This work alone would have been sufficient to rank him high among the Indian scholars, but Rajendra's was a dedicated life and he never rested on his oars. In 1878 he produced another work of similar magnitude *Buddha Gaya, the Hermitage of Sakyamuni,* in which he compiled a complete record of its archaeology. It may be mentioned that from the beginning of the century epigraphical and architectural remains of the temple of Buddha Gaya attracted the serious attention of scholars like Buchanan, Hamilton, Kittoe, Cunningham, Fergusson and others. It was, however, left to Rajendra to collate the works of all these scholars with elucidation and elaboration or modification as deemed necessary to fill up the lacunae, which he did as faithfully as possible in this omnibus volume.

(d) *Contribution to Bengali literature*: Last but not the least, mention must be made of Rajendra's ardent devotion to Bengali literature which he enriched not only by writing books and articles but also by starting the first series of a monthly Journal of the 'Penny Magazine' type—*Vividhartha Samgraha,* as early as 1851. This series continued till 1861 under the editorship of Rajendralal, producing thoughtful articles on history, natural sciences, art and literature, in a rather popular form, supplemented by attractive illustrations. Thus it became also the first illustrated

magazine in Indian languages. Needless to mention, the magazine captured the imagination of the Bengali intelligentsia who eagerly awaited its issue every month. Rabindranath in his *Jivan Smriti* (reminiscences) recorded the esteem in which the magazine was held at that time. Rajendra also served as the editor of the monthly magazine *Rahasya Sandarbha* started in 1863 under the joint auspices of the Vernacular Literature Society and Calcutta School Book Society. His works in Bengali included books on Physical Geography (1854), *Life of Sivaji* (1860), *History of Mewar* (1861), District Maps of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, and a text-book on Arts and Crafts (*Silpik Darsan*) (1860), etc. In these works Rajendra demonstrated in unambiguous terms that learned propositions can very well be presented in a popular manner, and for that purpose he strongly pleaded for a correct revision of Bengali spellings.

In addition to all these, Rajendralal was a regular contributor to different periodicals of his time both in this country and abroad, viz., the *Journal of The Royal Asiatic Society, Great Britain*, the *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London*, the *Calcutta Review*, the *Hindoo-Patriot*, the *Statesman*, the *Englishman*, the *Friend of India*, etc. In a word, Rajendra's literary output, to use the expression of my friend Dr. K. K. DasGupta, "is rather to be weighed than measured".

It has already been indicated that historiography in India, in the modern sense of the term, is almost coeval with the birth of the Asiatic Society, and Rajendralal owed his ideas of history as well as the methodology of its presentation mainly to this learned institution. It would not be too much to say that the scholar Rajendralal was a product of the Society, which provided him valuable training and still more valuable impetus in undertaking scientific investigations for the reconstruction of the history and the cultural background of the Indian people. Rajendralal, though a linguist, developed a rare historical insight based on objective reasoning, and in prosecuting researches he adopted the scientific method of interpreting history. To him, history, to be true and factual, must be founded on a rational analysis of available evidences, literary or archaeological, absolutely free from bias or prejudice, but fully humanistic, that is, reflecting the society and culture of the people in their proper perspective. His research works in different branches of Indology, already accounted for in the previous pages, will bear out how Rajendralal scrupulously followed the dictum mentioned above throughout his scholarly career extending over a period of long forty years.

The guide-lines of the research undertakings of Rajendralal may be summarised thus—

(i) exploration and exposition of source materials in a faithful and accurate manner.

(ii) critical and comparative study of the materials in their proper historical setting.

(iii) rational or logical analysis and interpretation of the relevant data, thoroughly disinterested in spirit, but fully reflecting the cultural state of a given people in a given period, and finally—

(iv) presentation of the historical facts in a lucid form, but maintaining a balanced judgement and objectivity of outlook.

In his works of bibliographical nature, Rajendralal faithfully followed the first principle enunciated above with wonderful zeal and vigour, as is illustrated in his nine volumes of *Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts* and other catalogues. But in this branch of study the most important work of Rajendralal was the *Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, in which not only did he provide reliable synopses of all the 85 texts in the Hodgson's collection, but assiduously analysed materials relevant for religious and cultural history contained therein. To that extent he displayed his acumen as an interpretative historian working on modern lines.

The same spirit guided him in his editions of numerous texts—Vedic, Brahmanical and Buddhist. We may once again refer to his editions of *Kamandakiya Nitisara, Yogasutras of Patanjali, Agni Purana, Lalita Vistara, Ashtasahasrika Prajnaparamita*, etc., each of which bears the stamp of his massive intellect and broad historical vision. It is common knowledge that the manner of his approach to the study of oriental texts created a sensation in the academic circles in his own time, but what is more, this was, and still is, considered equally essential by generations of scholars that came after him, the most illustrious of whom was Haraprasad Sastri, a direct disciple of Rajendralal, particularly in the preparation of systematic catalogues of old manuscripts.

In his treatment of epigraphic and numismatic materials, or, for the matter of that, archaeological remains, Rajendralal adopted the same principles of scientific objectivity in bringing out their true import and historical bearing. It is indeed a matter of satisfaction that most of his findings, born out of his logical marshalling of facts, hold ground still to this day. If, however, some of his conclusions came to be improved upon or reversed subsequently by other scholars, it has to be remembered that Rajendralal's efforts were those of a pioneer, who could work only on those materials that were available to him. Defects were therefore due mostly to the inadequacy of data, and not to any faulty methodology.

It may very well be asked why in spite of possessing the requisite qualities of a capable historian, Rajendralal refrained from attempting a complete history of ancient India. The answer would be that it was his conviction that such an attempt then would surely prove infructuous, unless intensive studies were conducted about the history of particular regions as a matter of basic discipline. Results of such regional studies may profitably be woven together to produce the cultural history of India.

Rajendralal's idea of history was set on a rather broad canvas. He accorded precedence not to kings and princes and their wars and battles, but to the people at large, their socio-economic institutions and religious speculations, that is, the factors that determined the cultural standard of the age. Rajendralal devoted his energies, therefore, to the study of the history of particular regions, like Orissa, Buddha Gaya and Nepal, and in each case his searching enquiry throws interesting light on the art and architecture as well as the religion and culture of the ages to which they referred.

The plan and methodology that he prescribed for himself in his great work, the *Antiquities of Orissa*, is itself a striking example of his keen sense of historical perspective. The comprehensive character of the project is evident from his frank statement that "Sir Gardiner Wilkinson's learned work *Ancient Egyptians* served me for a guide."

In the introductory chapter the author collected information about Orissa from all possible sources, beginning from the literary texts (the Epics, Puranas, etc.) down to local traditions and chronicles, including the Temple records (Madla Panjis). But fully conscious of the limitations of the traditional sources, Rajendralal sifted their evidence with great caution and would accept it only to that extent as would be substantiated or corroborated by concrete proof (*pathurey praman*, to use the author's own expression in Bengali).

Like an objective historian, Rajendralal prefaced his description of the particular type of Orissan temples and their sculptural and architectural embellisments with a thorough discussion about the origin and growth of Indian architecture as such. Rajendralal's view about the indigenous evolution of Indian architecture came to be challenged by no less a person than Fergusson, according to whom, "the Indians learnt architecture proper, and decoration of their buildings with carved ornaments and mouldings after their contact with the Greeks." Rajendralal controverted the contention equally boldly in his treatise on Buddha Gaya thus: "Fergusson seems to overlook, if not to ignore and repudiate, historical evidence, and to confine himself exclusively to the interpretation of lithic remains." Such was Rajendralal's force of conviction founded on historical analysis. Happily, later findings exploded the fantastic theory of the archaeologist, who had to admit the indigenous origin of building traditions among the Indians.

After recording an accurate description of the archaeological remains supplemented by illustrations, the learned author proceeds to glean from them relevant material reflecting the social condition of the temple-builders of Orissa as also an outline of the systems of religion that influenced the growth of Orissan art. Does not this method bear ample testimony to the scientific historiography of Rajendralal?

Rajendralal's works will testify almost unequivocally that he was

imbued with deep feelings of nationalism inasmuch as he pursued, with missionary zeal, his researches all his life in unfolding the pristine glory of ancient Indian culture; but at the same time it has to be admitted that he never deviated from the path of logic. His clear statement, "It is not for me to plead in favour of Indian Mythology, nor am I its apologist", will show that he was a true historian, first and last. Even his public utterances are marked with the same spirit of objectivity. At a meeting held in the Town Hall in Calcutta on July 2, 1870, Rajendralal declared: "If patriotism means an insensate love of everything that is ours, good or bad, away with such patriotism. If it is to teach us to rest satisfied with our Lares and Penates, our language and our civilisation, as they now stand, the less we have of it, the better." This was Rajendralal, endowed with a scientific mind not only in his academic pursuits but also in public life.

Rajendralal, who stood head and shoulders above his contemporaries in intellectual equipment and scholarly output, naturally exercised a deep and abiding influence on the minds of scholars, both Indian and European, of his own time as well as of succeeding generations. Sir Arthur Hobhouse, the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, in awarding him the degree of Doctor of Law, mentioned in his citation: "There is no European Society of oriental scholars to whom he is not honourably known, and there are many who have been glad to admit him as a member and a colleague." Professor Max Müller's estimate of Rajendralal is still more significant. He remarked: "He is a pandit by profession, but he is, at the same time, a scholar and critic in our sense of the term. In his various contributions he has proved himself completely above the prejudices of his class, freed from the erroneous views of the history and literature of India in which every Brahman is brought up, and thoroughly imbued with those principles of criticism, which men like Colebrooke, Lassen and Burnouf have followed, in his researches into the literary treasures of the country. His English is remarkably clear and simple and his arguments would do credit to any Sanskrit scholar in England"; and again, "our Sanskrit scholars in Europe will have to pull hard, if with such men as Babu Rajendralal in the field, they are not to be distanced in the race of scholarship."

The same feeling was expressed by Mr. A. W. Croft, the President of the Asiatic Society, in his obituary notice on the death of Rajendralal. He spoke thus—"It is not only within the walls of this Society, or even in Bengal, that his loss will be deplored; it will be felt throughout Europe; for wherever learning is cultivated, there the name of Rajendralal Mitra is held in honour. While we may congratulate ourselves that it was this Society which first gave him the opportunity of satisfying his inexhaustible craving for knowledge, we must gratefully admit that he has amply repaid the debt by the contributions he has made to Oriental learning, and

by the lustre that his name and attainments have shed upon the Society, of which he was one of the most distingusihed in the long roll of Presidents."

Poet Tagore very aptly described Rajendralal as a 'Sabyasachi', that is, one who is capable of using both his hands equally efficiently in discharging arrows. He was verily "an institution by himself".

To later Indologists, Rajendralal's works have all along provided materials for further researches as also the model to follow. Beginning with Mm. Haraprasad Sastri to this day, well-known scholars like Dr. Radhagovinda Basak, Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, Dr. Anukul Banerji, Dr. Biswanath Banerji and others have been follow ng the track laid down by Rajendralal. For years to come Rajendralal will shine as a beacon-light to inspire modern scholars in their attempts at charting the uncharted ocean of knowledge.

RAKHALDAS BANDYOPADHYAY

DR. KALYAN KUMAR DAS GUPTA

(University of Calcutta)

BORN at Baharampur in the district of Mursidabad, West Bengal, in 1886, Rakhaldas Bandyopadhyay was the only son of his parents, Matilal and Kalimati. Originally hailing from Sagardee in the district of Dacca, now in Bangladesh, the ancestors of Matilal settled on the other side of Lalbagh (lately known as Dahapara) under the patronage of Murshid Kuli Khan. During the battle of Palasi they sided with the Nawab and consequently with the latter's discomfiture had to leave their Lalbagh residence. The event seems to be not without significance. It debarred Matilal from turning into an Anglophile. A successful pleader at the Baharampur Bar, Matilal possessed a deep sense of self-respect, a quality inherited by his illustrious son. The story goes that when an English judge described the mofussil Bar as 'half educated', Matilal spiritedly retorted that a 'a quarter educated' Bench deserved no better.[1]

After passing the Entrance Examination with a scholarship from the Krishnanath Collegiate School, Baharampur, in 1900, Rakhaldas got admission to the Presidency College from where he graduated in 1905. His studies were interrupted thereafter and he had to wait for some time to obtain his M.A. in History in 1909 from the Calcutta University. At the Presidency College he learnt Sanskrit from no less a scholar than Haraprasad Sastri, an event which provided him with an enviable linguistic equipment. Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Saratchandra Bose, two of our eminent nationalist leaders, were his class-mates; close association with them might have enhanced his sense of self-respect, in other words, national feelings.

Around 1905 Rakhaldas married Kanchanmala, the daughter of Narendranath Mukherjee, the noted zamindar of Uttarpara, district Hughli, West Bengal. Of his two sons, Asim and Adris, the former died a premature death. Adris, still alive, following in the footsteps of his father has earned distinction as a scholar in the field.

Apart from Haraprasad Sastri, D. R. Bhandarkar, Theodore Bloch and Ramendrasundar Trivedi seem to have left an impress on the mind of young Rakhaldas. Collectively, all of them appear to have instilled in him a love for the glorious heritage of India. While Bhandarkar encouraged him by praising his collection of photographs of antiquities, Theodore Bloch acquainted him with Western methodology in historical, particularly archaeological, researches. Ramendrasundar Trivedi also en-

hanced his love of art and archaeology and it was under his direction that Rakhaldas along with some of his friends collected antiquities for the Bangiya Sahitya Parishat. Rakhaldas was, by and large, mentally prepared to undertake his journey in the realm of Indian history and culture. Incidentally, he had given evidence of his love for antiquities and aptitude for research in the preparation of a catalogue of archaeological objects in the collection of the Lucknow Museum when he had hardly finished his university career.

The archaeological propensities in Rakhaldas did not remain unrecognized for a long time. Almost immediately after his passing the M. A. Examination he got the appointment of an Archaeological Assistant in the Indian Museum in 1910, where he came in contact with Theodore Bloch. He was promoted next year to the post of the Assistant Superintendent in the Archaeological Survey of India. In 1911 he also served the University of Calcutta as an Honorary Professor of History. In 1917 he became the Superintendent of the Western Circle of the same department and held the same office till 1923. In 1924 he took over the charge of the office of the Superintendent of the Eastern Circle, Archaeological Survey of India, in Calcutta.[2] In 1928 he resigned from the government service when he was invited to join the Benares Hindu University as the Manindrachandra Nandi Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture.[3] He held the post till his premature death in 1930.

Son of an affluent father and son-in-law of a rich zamindar, Rakhaldas had an ostentatious way of living. He was a generous host and a man of charitable disposition. Whatever he had inherited and earned, he spent unhesitatingly, if not extravagantly, and as a result he had to face pecuniary embarrassments at the last stage of his life. Indeed, he died in a relatively distressed condition.[4]

Rakhaldas's short span of life was more than compensated by his rich academic output, including his archaeological undertakings. He was primarily an archaeologist and his title to fame rests chiefly on his epoch-making discovery of Mohenjodaro in the Larkana district, Sind, in 1922-23, which has pushed back the antiquity of Indian civilization to 5000 years and has linked up India with old civilizations of the world. In course of excavating the ruins of a Buddhist establishment at Mohenjodaro, Rakhaldas recovered certain inscribed seals with pictographic characters markedly resembling those found earlier at Harappa in the Punjab. He was 'quick to appreciate the value of his discovery' and at his suggestion Sir John Marshall undertook excavations at the site. The full significance of the discovery of Rakhaldas was shortly realized when a comparison of the finds from Mohenjodaro and Harappa led Marshall to assign them to a pre-historic civilization far earlier than any known at that time. While the discoveries at Mohenjodaro bear testimony to

"a highly developed city life... and a social condition of the citizens at least equal to that found in Sumer and superior to that prevailing in contemporary Babylonia and Egypt," they "stimulated public interest in Indian Archaeology to an unprecedented degree prompting the Government to make grants more liberally than before for carrying on excavations and explorations in different parts of the country". The discoveries at Mohenjodaro by Rakhaldas were followed by the excavations at Paharpur in the district of Rajshahi in North Bengal in 1925-26. By his excavations there, the archaeologist revealed for the first time "the general outline of the plan and scheme of decoration of the temple" of the famous Buddhist monastic complex of Somapura of early mediaeval Bengal.

Apart from his achievements in the field of archaeology, Rakhaldas showed his expertise in other branches of history: epigraphy, palaeography, numismatics, iconography and art-study. He was, indeed, a virtuoso in all these subjects and an adept in the technique of handling diverse source-materials. He made his debut as an epigraphist in 1909 by editing the Madhainagar grant of Lakshmanasena in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (henceforth *JASB*). Later he edited a number of inscriptions which include: Tarpanadighi copper-plate of Lakshmanasena, Naihati copper-plate of Vallalasena, Barrackpur grant of Vijayasena, Belava copper-plate of Bhojavarman, and the interesting seal inscription of Mahanavika Budhagupta recovered from Malay. His knowledge of epigraphy was based on a sound knowledge of palaeography, and apart from his notes and comments on the palaeography of the inscriptions he edited, he brought out two independent monographs: *Origin of the Bengali Script* (1919) and *Palaeography of the Hathigumpha and Nanaghat Inscriptions* (1929). Most of his works on palaeography are meticulous studies of the old letters of the records he had to deal with. And not in a few cases he gave evidence of his independent thinking by differing from the pioneers like Buhler and Kielhorn.

In the field of numismatics too, Rakhaldas has left his mark. His earliest essay in numismatics was published in the 'Numismatic Supplement' of the *JASB* in 1908 under the title 'Notes on Indo-Scythian coinage'. This was followed by a number of articles, which include among others, 'Punch-marked Coins from Afganistan' (*JASB*, 1910, NS, VI) and 'A new type of Audumbara Coinage' (*ibid.*, 1914, NS, X). The last mentioned article presents a detailed discussion on a large number of copper coins of an early Indian tribe, the Audumbaras, discovered at Irippal in the Kangra district, Punjab. Prior to the Irippal find only a few coins of the tribe were known and in the said article Rakhaldas has placed the Audumbaras on a solid footing in the numismatic history of India.[5] Apart from the stray papers on numismatics, Rakhaldas ventured to publish a comprehensive work on a specialized subject like numismatics in those days, and that too, in his mother tongue: *Prachin Mudra* (1915). The

treatise presents a lucid, yet scholarly, survey of the coinage of ancient India from earliest times to the coming of the Muslims.

No less able was his handling of materials on art and iconography. He studied them with his usual thoroughness and analytical acumen. He made an on-the-spot study of many important monuments like the temples of Bhumara (M.P.) and Gandhardi (Orissa). He also made a detailed study of the architectural and sculptural remains of the Tripuri region (M.P.) of the period of the Haihaya kings, as seen in his *Haihayas of Tripuri and their Monuments* (1922, published posthumously in 1931). In his *Temple of Bhumara* (1919) Rakhaldas has set the example of a detailed study of an individual monument in all its aspects. *Bas Reliefs of Badami* (1928) presents an analytical survey of the rich sculptural output of the caves at Badami (Maharashtra). The labour and erudition of Rakhaldas in this field is perhaps best evident in his monumental work, *Eastern Indian School of Mediaeval Sculpture*, published posthumously in 1933. The rich and prolific sculptural activities during the Pala-Sena period mainly in Bengal and Bihar constitute the subject-matter of the book. And incidentally it may be noted that some of the significant and interesting objects treated in it were discovered by the author himself.

Apart from analysing historical and archaeological data, Rakhaldas well succeeded in synthesizing the facts at his disposal. His *Age of the Imperial Guptas* (1924, published posthumously in 1931) and the two-volume *History of Orissa* (1930-31) bear testimony to this remark. Divided in six chapters, *Age of the Imperial Guptas* not only gives a readable account of the imperialistic activities of the Gupta rulers, but also deals with the art and architecture, the religious life of the people, and literature and coinage during the period concerned. Far from being a mere compilation, the book remarkably delineates the multifarious manifestations of the spirit of the age and in that respect it is the first work of its kind. Indeed, it was the first and the best study on the Gupta age till recently and deserves republication in the light of new discoveries and researches. Similar remarks are applicable to the *History of Orissa*. Comprehensive and monumental in nature (there are as many as thirty chapters and several appendices), the work is remarkable not only in wealth of materials, but also in respect of the interpretation and presentation of facts collected from a variety of sources. Of the genre of these works is the two-volume *Bangalar Itihas* (1915, 1917) in Bengali which covers the period from the earliest times to the death of Islam Shah, the son of Sher Shah in A.D. 1552-53. Though a Bengalee, Rakhaldas was rarely carried away by parochialism or any sort of prejudice in writing the account of his motherland. Modestly he observes in the preface to his *Bangalar Itihas* that in writing the first volume of this book on the basis of the materials collected for about ten years he has presented nothing more than the skeleton of the said history. Despite the author's modesty, the work is more than a mere skeleton

and it was the only dependable history of Bengal before the publication of the *History of Bengal* by the Dacca University (1943, 1948), prepared in collaboration with several writers under the supervision of R. C. Majumdar and J. N. Sarkar. Of other works of a general nature by Rakhaldas are *Palas of Bengal* (1915) and *Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India* (published posthumously in 1934). While the first monograph is the first critical compendium of information pertaining to the Pala rulers of Bengal based on a study chiefly of the epigraphical records of the period, the latter provides a consecutive narrative from earliest times to the period of the Muslim conquest. Written mainly for the students and lay readers, the usefulness of the book has been enhanced by the bibliographies for each period to be utilized by those who desire to specialize in particular fields of research. A still more modest attempt to write an outline history of India was made earlier: *A Junior History of India* (1930) is of the nature of a text book.

Rakhaldas was primarily an archaeologist and the archaeologist was preponderantly present in the historian. In other words, he was not prepared to accept anything as sober history which was not confirmed or corroborated by inscriptional, numismatic or monumental evidence. Not unreasonably he considered literature as a source of secondary importance. Thus, unlike his friend, Nagendranath Vasu, he was not prepared to accept the Kulinistic traditions as recorded in the 'Kulaji' or the 'Genealogical' literature as of any historical value. Describing Kulinism[6] as 'fantastic' he doubted about its establishment by Vallalasena, its traditional founder. In fact, he challenged the validity of Kulinistic traditions on the ground of the absence of their mention in the records of Vallalasena, Lakshmanasena and others.[7] Like some present-day historians he felt the necessity of writing history 'from the bottom up' and produced regional histories like *Bangalar Itihas* and *History of Orissa* for a better understanding of the general pattern of Indian history. In writing such regional histories he always kept himself alive to the fact that the history of any region of India is but an integral part of the history of India. Thus, in the preface to the first volume of his *Bangalar Itihas* he clearly avers that the author of the history of Bengal should write his narrative in tune with that of the different periods of India without losing the main thread. And he endeavoured to translate this idea by appending essential facts of Indian history, having bearings on the history of Bengal, in a nutshell at the end of each chapter, apart from necessarily linking them in relevant chapters. Though apparently a dry-as-dust historian, Rakhaldas was not concerned exclusively with bare facts. As a historian he was perfectly aware of the art of correlation of facts which makes history meaningful and lively. He also seems to have been conscious of the literary style, so essential for making history interesting and readable. Thus he

distinguished history from a gazetteer and described the *Vikrampurer Itihas* (History of Vikrampur in Bengali by J. N. Gupta) as no better than a gazetteer. While recounting the past of India (e.g. *Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India*) or the history of any of her regions (e.g. *History of Orissa* and *Bangalar Itihas*), Rakhaldas seems to have tried his best to make his account meaningful and lively, though in places his narrative verges on dry research. Finally, in advance of many of his contemporaries, he was aware of the anthropological roots of history. He devoted a full chapter to the races of India and their languages in his *Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India* (chapter II). He appears to have impressed on his readers that the history of India is to be understood in a variety of terms: political, social, economic, ethnological and cultural. Rightly he pointed out that what is known as Hinduism or Hindu culture is but the fusion of Aryan and Dravidian cultures and that before the period of Muslim intrusions there were "prosperous, progressive and enterprising Aryo-Dravidian communities" in Southern India who not only extended their sway to the North, but to Farther India, the Dutch East Indies and Malay.[8]

The outlook and attitude of Rakhaldas as a historian have been, I believe, clear from the preceding paragraphs. The archaeologist in him kept his loyalty steadfast to solid facts derived from archaeological sources. Indeed, he does not seem to have placed much reliance on literature as a source of history. His outright rejection of the Kulinistic traditions as recorded in a class of literature bespeaks his attitude, as has already been mentioned. Rakhaldas, it appears, chiefly aimed at discovering the 'dry truth' from the mass of facts and in this respect he seems to have approached the ideal set by Ranke: 'Wie as eigentlich gewesen', i.e. 'as it actually happened'. And again in this respect he seems to have belonged to the school of Rajendralal Mitra, R. G. Bhandarkar and Akshyay Kumar Maitreya, all of whom were, in general, cautious and restrained, and approached their sources in a true scholarly spirit. Like Rajendralal and Bhandarkar, Rakhaldas too tried to keep himself above all prejudices—chauvinism, parochialism and the like, and did not hesitate to criticize even his teacher, Haraprasad Sastri, when he saw the patriotic feelings of the latter prevailing over historical objectivity. He also criticized Akshyay Kumar Maitreya for his attempt to exonerate Sirajuddaula and to depict him as a good ruler.

Yet Rakhaldas could not help projecting his own personality in his writings. And perhaps it was only natural and inevitable. Though a sober historian, he was a litterateur as well. He wrote as many as eight novels, seven of which were historical ones. As a literary artist he could not always keep away his elemental emotion and imagination from his serious historical writings. Besides, Rakhaldas was a nationalist and wrote some of his books when patriotic feelings were running high in this country. The echoes of the contemporary political situation may thus

be heard in some of his works. For instance, in his tendency to glorify the Gupta rulers as the conquerors of the Saka and Kushana invaders of India (in his *Age of the Imperial Guptas*), one may hear him harping on the tune of anti-British feelings of his times. Is it very difficult to recognize his deep sense of appreciation for the contemporary freedom fighters in his eloquent tribute to Skandagupta in the following passage?[9] "He was the last great hero of Magadha who realised that it was his duty to defend the gates of India with the last drop of his life blood. He spent his whole life in the performance of this noble task and at the end of it sacrificed himself cheerfully in the performance of this sacred duty." Expressions like 'the last drop of his life blood', 'noble task' and 'sacred duty' reflect the mind of a historian who loved his country wisely and yet too well.

No less interesting is the passage relating to Asoka's responsibility for the decline and downfall of the Maurya empire. Though he had admiration for Asoka as a great king and administrator, he could not help concluding that the doctrine of *ahimsa* (non-violence) so religiously followed by the Maurya emperor sapped the vitality of the empire and brought about its eventual downfall. In his words:[10] "His idealism and religious fervour must have considerably damped the morale of his army. When he propounded the theory that the chief conquest was that by *dharma* and told his subjects that in his time bherighosa had become dhammaghosa he sounded the death-knell of the Maurya empire."

If the above passage brings out Rakhaldas aright, we may find him sharing the attitude and sentiments of a contemporary 'extremist' or a so-called 'terrorist', who hardly believed in the efficacy of the non-violence movement of Gandhiji.

Rakhaldas's patriotism is still more articulate in his novels, particularly *Karuna*, which has Skandagupta as its hero. One of the characters of *Karuna*, Agnigupta, embraced death in his fight against the Hunas for the ideal: 'Victory or death in the battle-field for the sake of the motherland'. Identical is his motto with that of our patriots, a number of whom lost their lives in their fight against the British imperialists.

Not only Skandagupta or Agnigupta. Sympathies of our historian went with whoever fought for the country's freedom, whether an individual or a race or a nation. Hence he had greater admiration for the South Indians for their stiff and continued resistance to the Muslim invaders of this country. Criticizing the Hindus of Northern India Rakhaldas remarked: "Want of unity and coherence (cohesion?) among the Hindus of Northern India was one of the principal causes of their downfall. They lacked the qualities which distinguished the Dravidian Hindus of the South, such as Harihara, or Krishnadevaraya of Vijaynagar."[11]

Frankly, an undertone of Hindu nationalism characterizes the writings of Rakhaldas. The obvious emphasis on 'Hindu' in the title of his work *Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India* is an illustration in point. As already

noted, the submission of the Hindus to the Muslim invaders seems to have pained the historian. Not only Islam; in the context of Buddhism too, he appears to have been a sincere Hindu. Thus, though he had admiration for Asoka as a great king and administrator, he failed to support his religious policy, which he believed to be intensely Buddhist. Indeed, he went to the extent of calling Asoka a bigoted Buddhist, and even compared him with Aurangzeb in respect of religious bigotry. According to him:[12] "Asoka's adoption of the Buddhist faith and his intolerance of the orthodox Indo-Aryan religious practices *must* have produced great disaffection throughout the entire empire, just as the *bigotry* of Aurangzeb caused the Rajput war and subsequently paralysed the Mughals" (Italics mine).

In the case of the Bengalee Hindu king Sasanka, the relatively anti-Buddhist bias of the historian seems to be more articulate. While he rejected the charges of Hiuen-tsang against Sasanka on the ground that they were levelled against a Hindu king by a Buddhist pilgrim, he laid rather undue emphasis on the Hindu-Buddhist conflict in his novel *Sasanka*.

In this connection another characteristic feature of Rakhaldas deserves mention: his love and regard for Bengal and Bengali culture. Bengalee kings like Sasanka and Dharmapala were his heroes, eminently fit to be the heroes of his novels of the same names. He appears to have thought that the discomfiture of the Vardhana kings of Thanesvara like Rajyavardhana and Harshavardhana at the hands of Sasanka led their sycophants, Banabhatta and Hiuen-tsang, to pour venom on the king of Bengal in their writings. In other words, describing Banabhatta and Hiuen-tsang as partisan writers Rakhaldas ignores their charges against Sasanka as politically and religiously motivated. The love of the historian for the art and culture of Bengal finds a rather subtle expression in the following observation:[13]

"From the 8th century to the 12th in the eastern provinces in northern India artistic activity is evident in a scale, which other provinces of the north and the south failed even to approach in magnificence, excellence and extensity. Here the Palas and the Senas excelled and even the proud Gurjara-Pratiharas of Kanauj, the Haihayas of Tirupati, the war-like Chahamana lords of Sakambhari, the learned Paramara chiefs of Ujjayini and Dhara and the proud Chaulukyas of Anahilapataka were compelled to yield first place to them. Mediaeval sculptures have been discovered, in varying numbers, in Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajputana and Antarvedi, but nowhere is their total number comparable to the output of a single century in Bengal and Bihar."

Thus in spite of his attempt to maintain objectivity, he could not, on occasions, maintain the calm detachment of a strictly neutral academic. In some of his works his sympathies tend to impart a romantic colouring to "his-story". In respect of Sasanka, for instance, his role was more

of a counsel for defence than of a judge.[14] Similarly, he could not have been fair to Asoka when he called him a 'bigoted Buddhist' and compared him with Aurangzeb in respect of his religious outlook. It has to be remembered, however, that he was not the only writer to hold Asoka responsible for the decline of the Maurya power. A more dispassionate historian like H. C. Raychaudhuri held a similar view, as will be apparent from the following passage:[15]

"Dark clouds were looming on the north-western horizon. India needed men of the calibre of Puru and Chandragupta to ensure her protection against the Yavana menace. She got a dreamer. Magadha after the Kalinga war frittered away her energy in attempting a revolution as Egypt did under the guidance of Ikhnaton. The result was politically disastrous....Asoka's attempt to end war met with the same fate as the similar endeavour of President Wilson."

And no less critical was Haraprasad Sastri, another eminent authority on early Indian history, on this issue. According to him,[16] a reaction promoted by the Brahmanas due to the markedly pro-Buddhist policy of Asoka led to the eventual dismemberment of the empire, and that in the assassination of Brihadratha, the last Maurya emperor, one can "clearly see the hands of the Brahmanas in the great revolution." Rakhaldas's view appears to have combined some elements of the theories of both Raychaudhuri and Sastri. Like Raychaudhuri he laid stress on the pacifist policy of Asoka as being chiefly responsible for the decline of the Maurya empire, while like Haraprasad Sastri he saw in Asoka's pro-Buddhist policy a cause of great disaffection of a large section of population leading to the paralysis of the Maurya empire.

In the context of his anti-Buddhist undertone, one may discern in the preface to his *Sasanka* an amount of anti-Muslim bias also. A careful study of the relevant passage will, however, show that the main contention of the author was that the Bengalees suffered a considerable setback due to the Muslim invasion and their culture stagnated for a long time. Hence, if there is any distinct strain in *Sasanka*, it is patriotic, and not religious. On the contrary, he was conscious of the need for the Hindu-Muslim unity, so essential for the integrity and prosperity of his country. His novels *Mayukh* and *Lutfaulla* bear ample testimony to this.

All that has been said above will therefore show that though Rakhaldas was largely and admirably a dispassionate historian, he was at times swayed by personal likes and dislikes. In other words, personal angle or purple patch is not unexpectedly present in the writings of Rakhaldas. And if, as Namier believes, history is "necessarily subjective and individual, conditioned by the interest and vision of the historian," Rakhaldas may be exempted from the charge of a lack of objectivity and dispassionateness.

Since the time of Rakhaldas considerable progress has been made

in the field of research and exploration pertaining to the early history of India. And in the light of these discoveries and researches some of the views and opinions of the historian are either to be abandoned or modified. Thus, his theory[17] that the Ara inscription of the year 41 (A.D. 119) refers to the great Kanishka, who was alive at the time, and that his sons Vasishka and Huvishka were his viceroys in India, is now hardly acceptable. Similarly, his claim that the sanctum of the Bhumara temple was enclosed by a large building on all four sides constituting a covered ambulatory path and that the walls of this building rose up from the edge of the terrace, its roof being attached to the sanctum as in the temple at Nachna, appears to be untenable on a closer scrutiny. Later examination[18] of the temple has shown the absence of any such covered ambulatory, the edge of the terrace having been fenced in by parapets with rounded tops, as parapet fragments of this type in considerable number were excavated by Rakhaldas himself and are lying at the site; a parapet with rounded top further excludes the existence of a wall on top of it. Again, the doubts of Rakhaldas regarding the genuineness of the Faridpur charters of Gopachandra, Dharmaditya and Samacharadeva[19] have now been set at rest by the discovery of the Mallasarul and the Jayrampur inscriptions of Maharajadhiraja Gopachandra and a few gold coins issued by Samacharadeva.[20] Besides, Rakhaldas could not devote much time and attention to the socio-economic history of ancient and mediaeval India, and his contributions in this respect are practically negligible. He, however, tried to compensate this inadequacy in his historical novels, where he brought the respective societies to life through his erudition, imagination and literary skill. In this respect he followed Maspero, the distinguished authority on the history of Egypt, whose historical novels form a class by themselves.[21] The success of Rakhaldas in the vivid portrayal of the life and time of the Bengalee people in his *Sasanka* and *Dharmapala* merits particular mention.

Reference may be made in this context to the literary talents of Rakhaldas. Though a professional historian, he was a litterateur of no mean merit. Indeed, his historical novels, depicting the past as living and many-coloured, have ranked their author as a competent literary artist. In his *Pashaner Katha* Rakhaldas has told the story of the past like an experienced *raconteur* and calls this work 'the background story of his historical novels.' Thus he was not a mere 'drybiscuit historian'. On the contrary by extending his interests to literature, he tried, as it were, to replace the cold and classical light of history with the rich hues of the stained glass of literature. Admittedly, he is one of our very few professional historians who was in unusual rapport with literature, his notable senior contemporaries being Haraprasad Sastri and Akshyaykumar Maitreya. And further, like them as well as Rajendralal Mitra of still earlier days, he devoted himself to enrich Bengali language and literature by publishing

the results of his researches in the mother tongue. Rakhaldas, it may be pointed out, is still the lone author in our language who ventured to write *Prachin Mudra*, a readable work on the numismatic history of ancient and early mediaeval India. And more, he has practically no successor who can write research articles in lucid Bengali.

Strict adherence to facts, scientific disinterestedness and critical acumen are the hallmarks of the writings of Rakhaldas. In other words, he had a fine capability to dissect the past scientifically. If he is seen on occasions as a patriot or nationalist, he has proved once more that history, when it goes beyond a mere catalogue of facts, becomes subjective and individual; conditioned by the interest and vision of the historian; and that history, consciously, almost semi-consciously, allies itself with the literature, when it becomes true history. As a serious member of his profession Rakhaldas spared no pains to collect facts from every possible source; after gathering his primary data he selected and classified them and made guesses and generalizations; and finally he tried to present the facts and his views in a readable manner as far as possible. In general, Rakhaldas was on guard against being swayed away by extra-historical considerations—regional, religious or otherwise—and tried to take his stand on the *terra firma* of facts and to uphold the truth. A considerable progress in historical researches notwithstanding, *Age of the Imperial Guptas* and *History of Orissa* are still indispensable in the relevant fields. While the former, when first published, was welcomed by an eminent historian like A. S. Altekar as "the product of a masterly hand containing a number of new and interesting solutions of several controversial problems in the political and administrative history of the period" and "fresh and illuminating" treatment of the architecture and plastic arts of the age, the second volume of *Bangalar Itihas*, published as early as 1917, was considered by no less an authority than Sir Jadunath Sarkar,[22] as late as 1948, as a landmark in the growth of our historical knowledge since the days of Stewart. According to Sir Jadunath, "the value of this work consists in its being...a complete index volume of Bengal inscriptions and coins, learned dissertations, genealogical lists and extracts from sources known up to the year 1915."

Indeed, judged by any standard of scholarship Rakhaldas is one of our front-rank historians. Though he is remembered chiefly for his epoch-making discovery of Mohenjodaro, he emerges as a significant historian with wide-ranging interests and deep erudition in a number of articles and works, particularly *Age of the Imperial Guptas, History of Orissa, Eastern Indian School of Mediaeval Sculpture* and *Bangalar Itihasa*. Short-lived as he was, he appears to have proved by his relatively enormous output the validity of the remark of Trevelyan:[23] "Life is short, art is long, but history is longest, for it is art added to scholarship."

REFERENCES

1. *Reminiscences, Speeches and Writings of Gurudas Banerjee*, edited by U. C. Banerjee, Calcutta, 1927, p. 37.
2. He took some time to assume his new office due to illness.
3. Adris Banerji has told me that his father became the victim of an official clique. Apprehending that the discoverer of Mohenjodaro, a 'native', would succeed Sir John Marshall as the Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India, a few European officers hatched a conspiracy against him in which some Indians also participated.
4. Adris Banerji has further told me that quite a good number of persons borrowed money from him. The unrealized money amounted to nearly one lakh.
5. For a comprehensive account of this tribe see K. K. Das Gupta, *The Audumbaras*, Calcutta, 1965.

   Rakhaldas was acclaimed by western scholars, even when he was barely 30, as "one of the best known workers in the field of Indian epigraphy and numismatics." He was admired by them particularly for his "open mind and the employment of sound methods and reliable materials." See *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1917, pp. 853-54. V2WX L6
6. Kulinism implies the division of the society into certain orders on the basis of certain virtues and qualities.
7. *Bangalar Itihas*, vol. I, reprint, 1971, p. 252.
8. *Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India*, p. 30f.
9. *Age of the Imperial Guptas*, p. 42. Rakhaldas, it is interesting to note, uses the word 'patriot' in the context of Skandagupta when he observes: "...like a true patriot he devoted himself solely to the task of securing the safety of his country." *Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India*, p. 175.
10. *Pre-historic Ancient and Hindu India*, p. 103. 128050
11. *Ibid.*, p. 305.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
13. *Eastern Indian School of Mediaeval Sculpture*, p. 5.
14. *Bangalar Itihas*, vol. I, reprint, 1971, p. 78f.
15. *Political History of Ancient India*, 5th edition, pp. 347-48.
16. *JASB*, 1910, p. 259f.
17. *Indian Antiquary*, XXXVII, p. 58f.
18. *Artibus Asiae*, XXXII, pp. 141-44.
19. *JASB*, 1914, p. 426.
20. Cf. R. C. Majumdar's remark: "Their [i.e. of the inscriptions] genuineness is no longer doubted by any scholar," *History of Bengal* (Dacca University), p. 51, n.2.
21. *Anandabazar Patrika* (Autumn Special), 1374 B.S., pp. 10-11.
22. *History of Bengal* (published by the Dacca University), vol. II, edited by J. N. Sarkar, p. 502.
23. *Clio, A Muse* (London, 1913), p. 34.

R. G. BHANDARKAR

DR. A. D. PUSALKER

(*Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona*)

SON of a clerk in the Revenue Department, R. G. Bhandarkar was born at Malwan in Ratnagiri District on 7 July 1837. After receiving his early education at Malwan and Ratnagiri, he completed the then current curriculum from the Elphinstone Institution in Bombay in 1858. He served first as a clerk and then as a teacher in the Elphinstone Institute. He was appointed Senior Dakshina Fellow for six years from 1859, of which he spent four years at Poona. After the foundation of the University of Bombay, he appeared for all the University examinations, and passed his B. A. in 1862 and M. A. in 1863. Then he was appointed Head Master at Hyderabad, Sind, in 1865. He wanted to enter the Revenue Department, but Howard, the then Director of Public Instruction, who had discovered the promising scholar and encouraged him to study Sanskrit, posted him as Head Master of Ratnagiri High School, where he worked during 1865-67. From 1867 to 1872, he was Acting Professor of Sanskrit at the Elphinstone College, Bombay, and from 1872 to 1879 Assistant Professor at the same College. Then in 1879, he was transferred to the Deccan College, Poona, as Acting Professor and was made Professor in 1881. He retired as Professor in 1893.

Bhandarkar was a member of the Syndicate of the University of Bombay from 1873 to 1882, and was appointed Vice-Chancellor after his retirement in 1893. In 1903, he was a member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council. He represented the University in the Provincial Legislative Council during 1904-08. He was made a C.I.E. in 1889, and was knighted at the Delhi Durbar in 1911 (K.C.I.E.).

Bhandarkar's *First Book of Sanskrit* appeared in 1864 and the Second in 1868, and these have popularized the teaching of Sanskrit in this part of the country. His critical review of Haug's edition and translation of the *Aitareya Brahmana*, which appeared in the *Native Opinion* in 1864, attracted the attention of Weber, who re-published it in *Indische Studien* (IX. 177ff). His first paper on a copperplate appeared in 1870 in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*. He delivered the first Wilson Philological Lectures on Sanskrit and the Derived Languages at the University of Bombay in 1877. From 1879 to 1891 he was engaged in the operations for the search of Sanskrit Manuscripts and has recorded his work in six Reports. In 1876 appeared his Critical Edition of the *Malatimadhava* in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. *Early History of the Deccan*,

which he prepared for the *Bombay Gazetteer*, appeared in 1884, and *A Peep into the Early History of India*, which he delivered as a lecture before a Poona audience, in 1890. His last major publication, in fact his *magnum opus*, was *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems*, published in 1913 in the Grundriss Series.

Bhandarkar was invited to attend the International Congress of Orientalists at London in 1876, for which he sent a paper on the Nasik Cave Inscriptions, but he could not attend it. In 1886, he attended the session at Vienna and read a paper on the Ramanuja and the Bhagavata or Pancharatra Systems.

When Gandhiji came to India for enlisting support for his South Africa struggle, during his Poona visit, both Tilak and Gokhale advised him to convene a meeting under the chairmanship of Bhandarkar so that people of both parties would attend, and when Bhandarkar obliged by accepting the chairmanship, actually a big gathering attended and Gandhiji's mission was successful.

Literary honours came to Bhandarkar after the world of scholars knew about his work. He was elected Honorary Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, London (1885), German Oriental Society (1887), American Oriental Society (1887), French Institute (1890). Hon. Ph.D. was conferred on him by the Universities of Göttingen (1885) and Calcutta (1908), and LL.D. by the University of Bombay (1904).

The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, which is a worthy and abiding monument to Bhandarkar, was formally inaugurated by Lord Willingdon, the then Governor of Bombay, on 6 July 1917, on the completion of Bhandarkar's 80th year, when a volume of essays, written by his friends, pupils and admirers from different lands, was dedicated to him. The volume contains forty essays on a variety of subjects, and the distinguished contributors include S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, G. A. Grierson, P. D. Gune, A. F. R. Hoernle, Ganganath Jha, S. Levi, A. A. Macdonell, J. J. Modi, J. H. Moulton, F. E. Pargiter, T. W. and Mrs Rhys Davids, Haraprasad Shastri, V. A. Smith, M. A. Stein, F. W. Thomas, B. G. Tilak and S. C. Vidyabhushan. Bhandarkar donated his personal library comprising about 3000 rare and valuable books, journals, papers, etc., to the Institute. He presided over the First Oriental Conference, organized by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, in 1919, and in the concluding part of his Address observed: "I close the active years of my life with an assured belief that sound critical scholarship has grown up among us, and that it will maintain its own against aspersions and attacks."

Bhandarkar passed away peacefully on 24 August 1925, which was the day of Rishipanchami. The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute observes the anniversary of Bhandarkar's death on the Rishipanchami day every year.

Bhandarkar had three sons, Shridhar, Prabhakar and Devadatta (D. R. Bhandarkar), of whom the youngest Devadatta survived him. Shridhar was a Professor of Sanskrit, and Prabhakar was a medical practitioner. Devadatta, after serving in the Archaeological Survey, retired as Carmichael Professor at the University of Calcutta.

Besides being a teacher, researcher and author, Bhandarkar was a Social Reformer and an active member of the Prarthana Samaj. He instilled new life into the literature of old Marathi saints by reviving their study and investing them with their dignity, at a time when they were not only neglected but despised by the newly educated. In fact, he was known in India more as a social and religious reformer than as a scholar. As a propagandist of social reform, Bhandarkar used his great equipment as a Sanskritist and a historian to show that many of the orthodox customs of his day had no foundation in the ancient Hindu religion.

He was a self-made man through talent and perseverance. He was not a prolific writer. His writings are characterized by thoroughness and precision. He would never go beyond what his sources warranted, and never took up the pen unless he felt sure of making a substantial contribution to existing knowledge. His historical work is based on sources which he used for the first time. He was a pioneer in applying western methods to the study of Sanskrit and Indian antiquities, and his work presents the happiest combination of the Orient and the Occident. He shed light where darkness stared us in the face. He participated in several controversies and came out successful. During the later years of his life, Bhandarkar was justly recognized as the Nestor of Indologists.

Bhandarkar's complete works—major books, articles, and lectures —have been brought out in four volumes comprising 2482 pages under the title *Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar* by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona, 1927-33). These can be broadly classified under (i) Sanskrit Literature, Religion and Philosophy, (ii) Contributions to Comparative Philology, and (iii) Historical and Epigraphical Researches, which show the versatility and wide range of interests of Dr. Bhandarkar.

He has rendered signal service to the history of Sanskrit literature and philosophy by his *Reports on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*. His two Books of Sanskrit enjoyed wide popularity in the old Bombay Presidency, and his Edition of the *Malatimadhava*, with critical text, introduction, etc., has set a model for editors of Sanskrit texts. His contributions on various religious sects and philosophical systems will still repay perusal. *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems* justly received highest encomiums from competent scholars. In his Wildon Philological Lectures and other papers on the subject, Bhandarkar blazed a new trail and has given a comprehensive account of linguistic development

from the Rigvedic language to the modern regional languages of northern India. We are concerned here with his historical and epigraphical writings.

The contributions of Bhandarkar to historical studies comprise *Early History of the Deccan*, *A Peep into the Early History of India*, and articles in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, *Indian Antiquary*, *Epigraphia Indica*, and *Proceedings of the International Congress of Orientalists* (all included in the *Collected Works*).

Early History of the Deccan, as already stated, was prepared for the *Bombay Gazetteer* in 1884. The second edition was published from Poona in 1895. "In the second edition," says Bhandarkar in the Preface, "I have embodied the results of fresh researches published by others and myself within the last ten years. Some of my own have, however, been laid before the public now for the first time." The third edition was brought out from Calcutta in 1928 by D. R. Bhandarkar in deference to the last wishes of his revered father "to bring out a third edition with notes". His father further "indicated what important records had been published since the last edition." According to D. R. Bhandarkar, "though much new material has been available...the main conclusions of the book from the period of the Early Chalukyas onwards have remained unshaken", and he has pointed out in the Notes the changes required in reconstructing the history of the earlier period.

Unfortunately, as a matter of fact, changes are required to be made in the later portion also, and what D. R. Bhandarkar's Notes contain are mere references to new articles and new inscriptions on particular topics. He does not indicate what changes are to be made in the text. The third edition thus is a mere reprint of the second edition, with a list of new inscriptions and new articles on some select topics. Even "Additions and Further Corrections" to the second edition have been merely copied, without giving page-references to the third edition, or without mentioning that they are to the second edition. As will be shown later, even obvious mistakes have not been corrected.

Volume III of the *Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar* contains a reprint of the second edition of the *Early History of the Deccan*, without, however, incorporating the "Additions and Further Corrections".

Now let us give a brief summary of the *Early History of the Deccan*. Though the author modestly calls it "merely a congeries of facts",[1] it "gives us a historical account of Western India from the earliest times to the Muslim conquest with a complete mastery of material (including the difficult language of the Sanskrit inscriptions) and a thorough command over the critical apparatus."[2] It is the first connected history of the Deccan for the period based on a thorough and critical analysis of all sources available till then. Besides political history and discussions about the genealogy and chronology of several dynasties, the book deals

with the social, economic and religious conditions of the period as also the state of literature and art, wherever material was available. After considering the various sources and their reliability, Bhandarkar gives a geographical description of the Deccan and makes a historical survey of the various dynasties that ruled over the Deccan in a chronological order beginning from the Mauryan times. Thus is unfolded before us a panorama in which appear the Satavahanas, Early Chalukyas, Rashtrakutas, Later Chalukyas, Kalachuris, Early Yadavas, Later Yadavas, and Silaharas. Numismatic evidence and accounts of foreign travellers receive adequate attention, and in dealing with controversial topics, such as the date of Kanishka, there is a full-fledged discussion from various aspects. This book is a pioneering attempt and the author has collected together literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources to present a connected account. It may be stated in brief that new facts brought to light subsequently fill up many blanks, such as prehistory of Maharashtra or the account of the Vakatakas; many lacunae can be filled up; several of Bhandarkar's conclusions are found to be wrong, vague, or inadequate, and for some points on which he could give no information, we can supply sufficient particulars. It is, of course, not possible in the course of this short critique to refer to all such cases; but attention will be focussed in the next sub-section on the more important of these, and the recent conclusions indicated. The dynastywise and chronological treatment is intended to facilitate appreciation of the extent and magnitude of the problem and the degree of Bhandarkar's contribution to it. In his account, Bhandarkar deals exhaustively with the religious, social, and economic condition of Maharashtra under the Andhrabhrityas or Satavahanas, as also with the religion under the Early Chalukyas and the Rashtrakutas, and the literary activities and religious and social conditions under the Later Chalukyas and Kalachuris. Bhandarkar's observations and conclusions in these respects remain almost unshaken by subsequent research.

The Appendices to the *Early History of the Deccan* deal respectively with (A) A Note on the Gupta Era, (B) A Note on Saka Dates, and (C) Introduction to Hemadri's *Vratakhanda*. The conclusion as regards the Gupta Era is that "the evidence in favour of Alberuni's initial date for the Gupta era appears to me to be simply overwhelming."[3] With regard to the Saka dates, the conclusion is that they "represent in *most* cases the years that had expired before the particular occurrences mentioned."[4] Introduction to Hemadri's *Vratakhanda* is the text of *Rajaprasasti*, I and II, not included in the Bibliotheca Indica edition of the *Vratakhanda*, which gives the genealogy of the Yadavas.

The next historical contribution by Bhandarkar is *A Peep into the Early History of India*, which gives a brief survey of the early history of northern India dealing with the Mauryas, Sungas and Kanvayanas,

Indo-Bactrian Greeks, Sakas, Kshatrapas, Satavahanas, Kushanas, and Guptas, and "presents a very valuable account of the Brahmanical revival movement under the Imperial Guptas as reflected in the branches of classical Sanskrit poetry, religious law, sacrificial ritual, the *Puranas*, 'the floating literature', astronomy, *Mimamsa*, logic, dialectics, and *Sankhya*."[5] That Bhandarkar's description of the intellectual activities of the Gupta age was considered authentic even as late as in the middle of the present century, would appear from the reference given to it in the latest edition of his work by Raychaudhuri.[6] The account of literary revival and renovation is characterized by the extensive range and erudition of the author. Bhandarkar's predilection for Sanskrit is seen in the comparatively large space devoted to the account of the various branches of Sanskrit literature and the details supplied. Though the scheme of chronology adopted by Bhandarkar for some of the dynasties is not accepted at present by most scholars, his account of the religious and social conditions and of literary development stands unaffected and authentic. Our critical remarks on some of the views expressed in this work appear in the next section.

Finally, we turn to the historical articles by Bhandarkar. It was a mere accident that turned Bhandarkar's attention to the study of copperplates and inscriptions. In 1870, one Parsi gentleman Dr. Adalji brought one copperplate found in Surat District to him for decipherment. Bhandarkar consulted Prinsep's Table and other material on paleography, deciphered the inscription, and published its transcript with translation and remarks in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*.[7] It was an inscription by the Gurjara Dadda, and, as shown later, was one of the forged inscriptions. In all, Bhandarkar wrote about 25 articles on copperplates and inscriptions, and eras, and a few more on the date of Patanjali. He gave critical remarks about the genealogy and chronology of the family of the donors, identification of places and persons mentioned in the grants, and historical account deducible from them. His epigraphical papers are either independent interpretations of original finds or criticisms and revisions of earlier interpretations. Taking a chronological survey of the inscriptions we find that he has exhaustively dealt with the Nasik Cave inscriptions of the Satavahanas and their successors, Chalukya copperplate grant of Nagavardhana along with genealogy and chronology of the early Chalukyas, Mercara copperplate, Karhad, Devli, and Navsari Plates of the Rashtrakutas, Valabhi copperplates and Valabhi chronology, Mandasor inscriptions, Buddhist Sanskrit inscription from Java, Buddhist inscription from Burma, Kalachuri copperplate from Belgaum District, Ganjam rock inscription, and Ghosrawan Buddhist inscription of the Pala period. In his article on the Mercara copperplate, he has compared the rulers mentioned with the Cheras given in the Tamil chronicles.[8] In one article he takes a historical survey

of the "Inscriptional Work of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society" chronologically under different dynasties.[9] Besides, there are discussions about the date of Patanjali,[10] allusions to Krishna in Patanjali,[11] Aryans in the Land of the Asuras,[12] etc., which throw wonderful light on several aspects of ancient Indian chronology. There is also an account of the antiquarian remains found in a mound and in the Brhamapuri Hill near Kolhapur.[13]

Though the credit of solving the problem of the Gupta era is given to Fleet, it was Bhandarkar who showed that Fleet's date of the epoch was incorrect by one year.

In our critical remarks on the *Early History of the Deccan*, we have restricted our observations to the important matters alone. Subsequent researches have added so much to our knowledge that practically on every page there will be some additional information about some matter, however trifling or unimportant. We shall review the account in a chronological order.

We begin with a note discussing Bhandarkar's views on the Satavahanas. At the outset, it may be stated that even now the problem of the genealogy and chronology of the Satavahanas is not settled. There are serious differences of opinion among scholars.

Conflicting Puranic statements, at times even in the same Purana, have resulted in serious differences of opinion among scholars with regard to the starting-point, duration, and the number of kings of the Satavahana dynasty.

There are mainly two theories about the starting-point of the dynasty.

Relying on the unanimous statement of the Puranas that Simuka, the first Andhra-Satavahana king, came to power after overthrowing Susarman, the last of the Kanvas, Bhandarkar, Raychaudhuri, Sircar and others take the beginning of the Satavahana rule to the first century B.C.

Bhandarkar, however, takes the period assigned to Sungas to include also that of the Kanvas, maintaining that the latter ruled contemporaneously with the later Sungas, and places Simuka about 73 B.C.[14] Bhandarkar's theory, based on a particular interpretation of one passage, runs counter to the Puranic testimony that Devabhuti, the last Sunga ruler, was slain by Vasudeva, the first Kanva, so that the last Kanva cannot be the contemporary of the last Sunga as Bhandarkar contends. Simuka flourished 45 years after the period of Kanva rule, i.e. in 30 B.C.

Smith, Jayaswal, Gopalachari, Rama Rao, Venket Rao and others, on the basis of the facts that the Puranas assign more than four centuries and a half to the dynasty and that the period of the dynasty cannot be pushed beyond the first quarter of the third century A.D., hold that the Satavahanas came into power in the third decade of the third

century B.C. under Simuka when the Mauryan empire began to disintegrate after Asoka. In the view of these scholars, the last Kanva, Susarman, was overthrown not by Simuka, but by one of his successors. We may state here that Bhandarkar's stand, which is also maintained by other scholars in the first group, that Simuka, the founder of the dynasty, overthrew the last of the Kanvas, can be supported on the ground that it is based on the only unanimous statement of the Puranas about the dynasty.

The *Matsya* and *Vayu*, on which Bhandarkar relies for his account of the Andhrabhrityas, differ regarding the number of kings and the duration of the dynasty. As against 30 rulers and about 456 years given by the *Matsya*, the *Vayu* has 17 rulers and about 280 years. Bhandarkar, however, seeks reconciliation by stating: "The *Vayu* and *Matsya Puranas* each give a correct account but of different things."[15] According to him, the *Vayu* refers to the main branch, while the *Matsya* includes the princes of the collateral branches also. He thus attempts coordination of the conflicting statements in these two Puranas by supposing that the longer period and the corresponding longer list are made up by including the regnal periods and names of all rulers of the collateral lines of the Andhra dynasty. This suggestion has been accepted by scholars, though some demur to it. Bhandarkar's theory of conjoint rule of Gautamiputra Satakarni and his son Vasishthiputra Pulumayi,[16] though supported by D. R. Bhandarkar, has been rejected by practically all scholars, as the ground on which it is based is explicable otherwise. Further, Ptolemy's mention of Pratishthana as the capital only of Pulumavi, and the absence of any coin or charter issued jointly by Gautamiputra and Pulumavi render the theory untenable. The generally accepted view is that Pulumavi succeeded Gautamiputra. Bhandarkar's identification of Vasishthiputra Sri Satakarni of Kanheri with Vasishthiputra Siva Sri Satakarni of coins and Sivasri of the *Matsya* is regarded "as nothing more than a mere conjecture" by Raychaudhuri.[17]

Before turning to the Abhiras, some observations seem to be called for about the role of the Puranas in reconstructing ancient Indian history in the context of what Bhandarkar wrote about the credibility of the Puranas and the deductions Basham drew therefrom.[18] Though there may be some justification for Bhandarkar for relying on the testimony of only the *Matsya* and *Vayu*, knowing as we do much about the dynastic accounts in the Puranas, especially on account of the likelihood that even a later *Purana* may embody an earlier tradition, it behoves us to take into account all available Puranic evidence and then evaluate it. Further, numismatic and epigraphic evidence has many a time confirmed the statements of the Puranas, which speaks against their wholesale condemnation and exclusion. When the Anglo-Saxon chronicles are used for historiography after evolving a technique and a critical apparatus,

similar methods can be evolved for the Puranas and other literary references in order to "contextualize" them. They are to be properly interpretated after supplying the necessary correctives for their exaggertions, contradictions, allegories, etc.

In the next section, while dealing with the Abhiras, Bhandarkar refers to "Virasena Abhira, the son of Damari and of Sivadatta Abhira,"[19] which is based on a wrong reading of the Nasik Cave inscription No. 15. The correct reading, as given by Senart,[20] is: "Isvarasena Abhira, son of Sivadatta Abhira, son of Madhari."

Between the Satavahanas and the Early Chalukyas come the Vakatakas, and no one will find fault with Bhandarkar for there being no reference to the Vakatakas even in his second edition, published in 1895, because the Vakatakas do not figure even in the second edition of Smith's *Early History of India,* published in 1908. Smith wrote on the Vakatakas in 1914 on the basis of their copperplates and inscriptions available till then, and incorporated their account in the third edition of his book. Though the inscriptions of the Vakatakas were known since 1836, they were earlier taken to be Yavanas or Greeks. In 1928, when the third edition of Bhandarkar's *Early History of the Deccan* was issued by D. R. Bhandarkar, he had no excuse for not making any reference to the absence of the Vakatakas in Bhandarkar's work. He should at least have indicated the fact in his Notes and referred to the material on the subject.

With regard to the Early Chalukyas,[21] it may be stated that the Mudhol Plates[22] refer to Pulakesin's son Pugavarman, who is not mentioned also in Nilakanta Sastri's latest book on South Indian history. Bhandarkar's identification of Govinda who, along with Apyayika, attacked Pulakesin II, with Rashtrakuta Govinda I[23] is chronologically untenable according to Altekar.[24] Neulkunda grant, published in 1939, of Adityavarman's son Abhinavaditya[25] throws welcome light on the dark period in the Chalukya history from A.D. 642 following Pulakesin's defeat by Pallava Narasimha to A.D. 652 when Vikramaditya established Chalukya supremacy. This inscription shows that Adityavarman (an elder son of Pulakesin) and his son Abhinavaditya are to be assigned to this period. Sastri's work, curiously enough, is silent about this inscription. It may be observed that there are no major changes in the genealogy and chronology of the Early Chalukyas as given by Bhandarkar and Sastri.

Now we turn to the Rashtrakutas. Bhandarkar's view that the vicious relative slain by Krishna "could not have been Dantidurga as supposed by some scholars",[26] has been supported by Altekar, who takes that relative to be "most probably...Karkka II" and adds: "Probably Rahappa was another name of Karkka",[27] whereas Bhandarkar states: "Who this person (i.e. Rahappa) was we have not the means of determining."[28]

Bhandarkar's identification of Elapura with Elura as against Fleet, who identified it with Yellapur in the Northern Kanara District, is correct.[29]

On page 90 occurs a very serious mistake, which ought to have been corrected by D. R. Bhandarkar when issuing the third edition. Here the word *Vatsaraja*, which refers to the Gurjara Pratihara king of Kanauj, has been rendered as "the king of the Vatsas, whose capital must have been Kausambi, the modern Kosam near Allahabad". As a matter of fact, though at another place also[30] Bhandarkar describes Vatsaraja in identical words, he has correctly mentioned him as the Gurjara king while surveying the inscriptional work of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.[31]

The rebellion of twelve kings against Govinda was headed by his brother Stambha or Kambha, whose name is not mentioned by Bhandarkar. The inference that Jagattunga, the son of Nirupama, must be Govinda himself and no other[32] receives confirmation from later records. Altekar replies to Bhandarkar's suspicion, expressed in the supplement to the first edition, that "there might be something wrong about the dates of Amoghavarsha on the ground that it was very improbable that a king should have ruled for so long a period", i.e. 64 years, by referring to Sanjan Plates which show that Amoghavarsha was a child of six at his accession and by stating that he could, therefore, have ruled for 64 years.[33] It may be observed that Bhandarkar does not repeat his suspicion in the second edition.

Bhandarkar's objections to the theory that Govindamba was the name of another wife of Jagattunga[34] have been answered by Fleet, and it is clear that Jagattunga married two wives—the Chedi princess Lakshmi and her sister Govindamba: the elder son Indra was born of Lakshmi and the younger Amoghavarsha of Govindamba.[35] Bhandarkar's view that "Indra had a very short reign" and that "Govinda IV was on the throne in Saka 841"[36] (=A.D. 919) is not correct, because Chinchani Plates of Indra III are dated in Saka 848 (=A.D. 926).[37] Sircar criticizes Altekar for giving 922 as the last date for Indra and Sastri for giving 927, and concludes that "Indra III ruled till the end of 928 A.D."[38] In this connection, it may be stated that in his latest contribution, Altekar gives 914-928 as the regnal period of Indra and states, on epigraphic evidence, that "Indra's death may be placed about the middle of A.D. 928."[39]

With regard to Bhandarkar's statement that the Later Chalukya dynasty was not a continuation of the earlier one,[40] it may be observed that the latest view, supported by literary and epigraphic data, is that there is nothing to disprove the connection between the earlier and the later Chalukyas. In connection with the expeditions of Tailapa,[41] the recent view is that he could not have invaded Gujarat and could not have fought the Chedis. As to the account of Somesvara II given by Bhan-

darkar on the strength of Bilhana,[42] it should be noted that the testimony of Bilhana and the inscriptions of Vikramaditya VI should be relied on only when confirmed by independent evidence. Bhandarkar's identifications of Rajiga and Vishnuvardhana have been corroborated by subsequent historians.[43]

As regards the death of Kalachuri Vijjana or Bijjala which, according to Bhandarkar,[44] "took place in Saka 1089...or A.D. 1167", *Early History of the Deccan*, edited by G. Yazdani, presents mutually contradictory views: according to Altekar, Bijjala "was assassinated in A.D. 1167",[45] while Sastri favours the view that Bijjala was still ruling in A.D. 1168 and quotes Fleet's statement that Bijjala abdicated in favour of his son Sovideva probably in April 1168.[46] Altekar controverts Bhandarkar's view that Jhanjha, the father-in-law of Yadava Bhillama, "was probably the Silahara prince of Thana of that name",[47] on the ground that the latter "flourished between c. A.D. 910 and 930, and it seems unlikely that a prince who ruled from c. A.D. 980 to 1000 could have been his son-in-law."[48] The editors of the recently published Dharwar Plates[49] seek to explain the differences in the Gadag Plates and Hemadri on the basis of the genealogy as given in the Dharwar Plates. Bhandarkar's view that Kakatiya Ganapati was kept in prison by his uncle Rudra[50] is shown to be untenable by Altekar on the strength of the Palampet inscription, which states that Ganapati was taken a prisoner of war by the Yadava Jaitugi.[51] As against Bhandarkar[52] and Altekar,[53] who take Singhana to have succeeded his father in about A.D. 1210, Ganguly[54] and Sastri[55] take the year to be about A.D. 1200. With regard to the identification of Jajjalla and Kokkalla, Altekar agrees with Bhandarkar[56] that they were rulers of Chhattisgadh and Tripuri, but suggests that "the local rulers of Jabalpur and Tummana may possibly have been known as Kokkalla and Jajjalla to their contemporaries."[57] Ganguly, however, takes Jajjalla and Kokkalla as the rulers of Seringpatam and Virata.[58]

Finally, reference may be made to the points about which Bhandarkar stated that no information was available. The province over which the Nalas ruled was not known to Bhandarkar.[59] It appears that their territories originally "lay in the Bastar-Jeypore region."[60] Bhandarkar disagrees with the identification of Tagara with Devagiri or Junnar and proposes Dharur as the site of the ancient city,[61] while elsewhere he writes that the town has not yet been identified.[62] According to Altekar, Ter, proposed by Fleet, appears more probable, and now the identification with the same Ter in Osmanabad District, about 95 miles southeast of Paithan, seems to have been generally accepted.[63] "Sribhavana, which", according to Bhandarkar, "has not been identified",[64] has been correctly identified with Sarbhon in Broach District.[65]

Now, critical remarks about the Appendices. In connection with the Gupta era, as stated by Thomas, Bhandarkar "took the right view

from the first."[66] In his next article on the subject, Bhandarkar joins issue with Fleet, and as against the latter's view, conclusively proves that "the epoch of the Gupta era is 318-19 A.D. and not 319-20 A.D. as determined by Mr. Fleet, and its first year was 319-20 A.D."[67] His view about the Saka era is also correct.

Now we turn to *A Peep into the Early History of India* for critical remarks.

The scheme of chronology adopted by Bhandarkar for the Indo-Scythians and Indo-Parthians, whose dates he refers to the Saka era, is not accepted at present. The order of rulers among what he calls the Imperial Sakas requires to be changed as shown in the footnote.[68] The dates of the Northern Kshatrapas are to be referred to the era which later came to be known as the Vikrama Samvat, and not to the Saka era, as is done by Bhandarkar. He changed his views more than twice about the date of Kanishka, as will be presently shown in a note. He correctly refers Nahapana's dates to the Saka era.

As against Senart and Bühler, who take *Hidaraja* in Asoka's inscriptions as a proper name, Bhandarkar takes *hida* in the sense of *iha* (here), which is the correct interpretation.[69] Subsequent research requires changes to be made in the extent of Asoka's empire as given by Bhandarkar, especially with regard to the southern boundary. Though there is still no agreement about the location of the kingdom of Satiyaputra, which Bhandarkar places "along the Western Ghats and the Konkan coast below",[70] it seems to refer to the region further south comprising portions of modern Travancore.[71]

Now the articles. The plates deciphered by Bhandarkar in his first article turned out to be "Ilao (Broach District) Spurious Plates of Gurjara M. Dadda (II) Prasantaraga mentioned under No. 1081 in Bhandarkar's List. D. R. Bhandarkar, however, gives no reference to Bhandarkar's editing of the Plates, but refers to Fleet.[72] With regard to the Nasik Cave Inscriptions, reference has already been made to the correct reading of one inscription relating to the Abhiras. With but a few controversial points, most of Bhandarkar's readings and interpretations have been accepted by later scholars. In Inscription No. 17, what Bhandarkar read as *dvatrimsat-nadhigeramulasahasrapradena* and translated as "gave capital worth a thousand for thirty-two Nadhigeras"[73] has been read and translated by Senart as *dvatrisata-Naligeramula* (who has given 32,000 stems of cocoanut trees).[74] In a later article Bhandarkar is inclined in favour of taking *nalikera* for *nadhigera*.[75] What Bhandarkar took as *sudasanehi* (*sudarsanaih*) and *sama* [*vi*] *lapadasa* (*savilapadyasya*)[76] have been respectively read as *sudisanabhi* and *samalipada*—both names of villages;[77] what he read as *pisajipadara* and found "unintelligible",[78] turned out to be "*Pisajipadaka*" (Skt. *Pisachi-padraka*), name of a village.[79] In No. 18, about the word *Kusana*, Bhandarkar remarks: "I have not been able

to determine the sense of this word: but probably it means something connected with the Buddhistic rite of Kasina."[80] The word occurs also in No. 16. At both places Bhandarkar retains it in English translation. While Senart states that "*Kusana* means a monthly stipend, assigned to every monk during a certain period of the year, and probably to be applied for his food",[81] Sircar renders in Sanskrit as *Krisanna* and translates: "minor food (*amukhyahara*)—probably including minor necessities".[82] In the Mercara Copperplate grant, the chronology given by Bhandarkar of the Chera kings is correct and the names are found to be of the Western Gangas of Gangavadi.[83] As regards Bhandarkar's statement that "Khakharata is Kshaharata, which was another name of Nahapana",[84] it may be observed that Kshaharata is "an official title and not the name of a family or a clan as is usually held."[85] Bhandarkar's conjectural identifications of Navanara and Dattamitri have been found acceptable by later scholars.[86]

It is well known that in his controversy about the date of Patanjali, Bhandarkar worsted Weber and Peterson. With regard to *Madhyamikan* or *Mādhyamikan*, which Bhandarkar rightly took as the residents of *Madhyamika* or *Mādhyamika*, it may be noted that the reading now accepted is *Madhyamikam*, and *Madhyamika* has been identified with Nagari in Rajasthan.[87]

Now, we shall take a chronological survey of Bhandarkar's writings on the date of Kanishka. In the *Early History of the Deccan* (1884), Bhandarkar gives reasons why he considers Oldenberg's view that Kanishka was the founder of the Saka era to be untenable; but he does not specify any date for Kanishka.[88] In 1888, he had "found reasons to refer him (i.e. Kanishka) to the middle of the second" (century).[89] Stating that "the practice of omitting hundreds in dates has long existed in that part of India", Bhandarkar, in his *A Peep into the Early History of India* (1900), thinks that "the conclusion is reasonable that the dates in the inscriptions of these three Kushana princes are abbreviated by the omission of two hundreds" and refers the dates to the Saka era, so that the date of Kanishka come to be 200 Saka or 278 A.D.; however, he admits that the numismatic evidence (which he calls numismatic theories) goes against him and he tries somehow to explain it away.[90] In 1905 (reprinted 1915), Bhandarkar "assigned him (i.e. Kanishka) to the first quarter of the third century" and "put forward the supposition that Kanishka founded an era of his own, but that its initial date must be about A.D. 200", adding in a footnote: "Since the above was written several other inscriptions containing the name of Kanishka have been discovered and the whole evidence requires a thorough sifting."[91] Later on (1909), however, as he found that the existence of the practice of omitting hundreds "at such an early period cannot be regarded as substantiated by any positive evidence," he modified his opinion (regarding A.D. 278) and stated that "Kanishka used an era of his own....the initial date should be about

260 A.D." In a genuine scholarly spirit he added: "The question is still open and cannot be regarded as settled until some fresh discovery gives us certain information as to Kanishka's date."[92]

There is a wide divergence of opinion among competent scholars as to the date of Kanishka. The School of Oriental Studies convened a conference in London in 1960 on the date of Kanishka and the discussion showed that it is still uncertain and the problem still eludes solution. There are mainly four theories about the date of Kanishka, which may be arranged in chronological order as follows:

The theory once started and later given up by Cunningham that Kanishka started the era, later known as the Vikrama Samvat, was supported by Fleet and Kennedy.

Fergusson's theory that Kanishka was the originator of the era, later known as the Saka era, has found support from Oldenberg, Thomas, R. D. Banerji, Raychaudhuri, J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, Sircar, Majumdar and several other scholars, and has gained such a wide acceptance that it may be taken as the generally accepted view.

Second quarter of the second century has been supported by Marshall, Konow, Smith and a few others. Ghirshman favours A.D. 144 as the date of Kanishka's accession.

Majumdar, at one time, equated Kanishka era with the Traikutaka-Chedi era of 248 A.D., and Bhandarkar, as already stated, placed Kanishka in different years of the third century.

We can get an idea of the methodology followed by Bhandarkar by the actual study of his writings. He first subjected to a thorough and critical examination all the available evidence on a particular subject, with special reference to the comparative value of the source material, and then set forth his views with courage, conviction, and self-confidence, in the manner of a judge and not an advocate. Before taking up pen, he made sure of his facts, marshalled them into premises, and drew his conclusions with the rigidity of the strictest syllogism. Further, he brought to bear on his work the western philological and historical methods.

We can get glimpses of his ideas of methodology from his articles on "Critical and Comparative Methods." In them, Bhandarkar advocates strict adherence to impartiality as a judge and condemns the attitude of an advocate or a prosecuting counsel in a scholar. He deprecates the tendency of the European scholar "to trace Greek, Roman or Christian influence at work in the evolution of new points and to modernize the Indian historical and literary events", and is equally harsh on the Indian scholar whose "tendency may be towards rejecting foreign influence on the development of his country's civilization and to claim high antiquity for some of the occurrences in its history", and advise both to "devote respectful attention to...each other."[93]

The credibility or otherwise of the sources, according to Bhandarkar, was to be ascertained just like the testimony of witnesses in a law-court.[94] His views about traditions and analogies deserve careful attention, as these affect the critical and comparative method. After referring to several traditions, which run counter to facts, he states: "...traditions are not to be entirely rejected. An endeavour should be made to ascertain their antiquity, as their credibility must be considered to be proportionate to it; and if they are in themselves probable and stand all critical tests, they may be provisionally accepted."[95] While sounding a note of warning about the danger of superficial or insufficient analogies in the realm of philology, he states that scholars working in literary or historical studies "are particularly open to their influence, especially when they lead to or support a theory which is striking."[96] "If we wish to know and understand the truth about a point," he says, "whether in science or practical life, we should seek analogies, find out, if we can, the history, and criticize, not foolishly and ignorantly as we often do, but according to well-defined and rational principles."[97] While criticizing Fleet, Bhandarkar enunciates one more principle of his methodology: not to make any supposition "without a particle of evidence to support it."[98]

That history does not mean merely political history but has wide scope which modern historians are emphasizing now, had been visualized by ancient Indians by enlarging the scope of history to include every aspect of human activity. The fact that Bhandarkar in his historical writings refers to the social, religious and economic conditions of the periods described by him indicates his belief that political history alone is not the exclusive business of the historians, who should deal with other topics also.

Though in his major historical writings Bhandarkar is severely objective and does not moralize or pass value judgements, in his Addresses and other writings, we find him recognizing Clio as Moral Instructress. He quotes with approval "one of the greatest historians of England", probably Acton, as acknowledging "one lesson and only one history may be said to repeat with distinctness, that the world is built somehow on moral foundations; that in the long run, it is well with the good; in the long run, it is ill with the wicked." The same historian is further quoted: "First, it [history] is a voice for ever sounding across the centuries the laws of right and wrong....Justice and truth alone endure and live. Injustice and falsehood may be long-lived, but doomsday comes at last to them, in French Revolutions and other terrible ways."[99] At another place, Bhandarkar remarks: "Two of the greatest historians of England have told us that the Moral Law governs the affairs of the world: its observance alone ensures national prosperity. One of them I have quoted elsewhere, and will now ask your attention to the observations of the

other. The strongest of the forces, which are steadily bearing nations onward to improvement or decay are, according to Lecky, the moral ones. 'Their permanent well-being,' says he, 'is essentially the outcome of their moral state.' The Moral Law seeks to purify private life and to effect social justice, and through these alone is the political well-being of a nation possible."[100] "Moral Law", according to Bhandarkar, "is the unchanging law of progress in human society."[101]

In concluding Bhandarkar's ideas of history, we may give his view of a popular text-book of Indian History, which deserves reiteration even after the lapse of three score years:[102]

"...the writer of a history of India for the use of ordinary lay people should give the broad, salient facts which have now been placed beyond the possibility of doubt, and, if he enters into details, they must be such as have been accepted by all scholars or are supported by unimpeachable evidence. If there are conflicting or inconsistent views about a certain matter, all these should be given, and, if they cannot be given, that matter should be entirely omitted. All the available evidence should be carefully gone into, and the facts ascertained should not be combined or connected in a manner to conflict with other equally well-known facts. No statement should be made for which there is no authority, and in all cases references should be given in the footnotes. A book written on such principles may then be recommended as a safe guide to lay-readers."

For getting indications of Bhandarkar's biases, beliefs and suppositions, we have to turn to his Convocation Address and other Lectures and writings on Social Reform, etc. We shall refer here to his views about (i) the British connection with India, (ii) individual and national characteristics of the Indians, (iii) patriotism, also false race-pride, and (iv) prevalent western theories. It may be stated at the outset that none of his biases, beliefs or suppositions affected his historical writings in the least.

Bhandarkar waxes eloquent over the British connection with India. "I believe it to be an act of Divine Providence," says he, "that the English alone of all the candidates who appeared about the same time for the empire of India should have succeeded." He mentions the Marathas, the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the French, and states that "the Germans and the Austrians do not themselves enjoy the freedom that we do under the British and Russia is the most despotic of all European States and is perhaps as barbarous as ourselves without our mildness."[103] Elsewhere he thanks his "country's stars that she had not fallen into the hands of the Germans" but "into the hands of a nation that has a conscience."[104] It was a matter of pride for him that "India is one of the brightest jewels ...in the British Crown."[105] He expresses a strong doubt as to our good qualities being "due to our continuing to be under British influence or to our education."[106]

Smith has been severely criticized for prophesying the inevitable relapse of India into political chaos "if the hands of the benevolent despotism which now holds her in its iron grasp should be withdrawn."[107] Bhandarkar expresses almost the same sentiments: "If they should retire, we should immediately return to the old state of things."[108] According to him, "we really were not free under the old native monarchs."[109]

As regards our national characteristics, Bhandarkar says: "We are devoid of the sense of public duty....there is lack of corporate consciousness and our actions in political matters are guided on the whole by selfish and individual interests."[110] At another place he mentions that "Hitherto India has lived an individual life and not a corporate or national life," and gives want of national consciousness as the reason of foreign conquest.[111] On his return from Vienna after attending the International Congress of Orientalists, he said: "All that I saw in Europe deepened the impression that, as we are, we are an inferior race in point of energy."[112]

Bhandarkar was conscious that the country was fallen and wanted it to be raised, but that was to be done by taking advantage of our connection with the British.[113] In his view, national independence was unthinkable in the case of India, as it was divided into a number of communities hostile to each other and had not even a conception of free or representative institutions in the course of its history. India was not fit for political privileges and there was hardly any probability of their being used for the lasting benefit of the country.[114]

Bhandarkar had peculiar views about a patriot and patriotism. He says: "He only is a true patriot who, with an unprejudiced mind and with the light that God has vouchsafed to him, examines the manners, customs, and institutions of his country and the character of his people, fearlessly exposes the abuses or evils he may find therein, and earnestly calls upon them to reform and improve even at the risk of offending them and being stoned by them.... if he is a true patriot, he must be prepared to sacrifice his time, money, convenience, interests and even reputation for the good of his country...."[115] According to him, "Somehow or other, in Bengal and in our part of the country, a false race-pride has sprung up and dominates the minds of a great many persons, old as well as young." These persons say that good ideas in European literature are not foreign to us, and Europe has got little or nothing which our ancestors had not. This attitude he characterizes as false patriotism.[116]

He wants Indians to "move on, side by side with the Europeans, in the great fields of thought", to make discoveries, take their "legitimate place among the investigators of the political, literary and religious history of our country", the field hitherto monopolized by the German, the French and the English, and compel the approval and even the admiration of the European scholars.[117]

Connected with his view, quoted above, that "Moral law is the un-

changing law of progress in human society", is Bhandarkar's belief in the law of progress or evolution, which, he says, "is the law of God", and "is applicable in the material and spiritual world." "The law implies that there has been throughout the universe a progress in the material as well as the spiritual world from the simple to the complex, from the dead to the living, from good to better, from the irrational to the rational."[118]

The law of evolution or progress was largely the product of Darwinism, based on the principle of continuity and causality, which have been declared as illusory. Modern historians like Fisher do not countenance this law of evolution. Fisher says: "I can see only one emergency following upon another, as wave upon wave, only one great fact with respect to which, since it is unique, there can be no generalisations, only one safe rule for the historian: that should recognise in the development of human destinies the play of the contingent and the unforeseen. Progress is not a law of nature. The ground gained by one generation may be lost by another. The thoughts of men may flow into the channels which lead to disaster and barbarism."[119]

Bhandarkar also seems to believe in what he calls "the inexorable law of the survival of the fittest."[120]

Further, he strongly advocated "the fact that affinity of languages points to a descent and consequently to a common nationality."[121] It is now regarded as one of the most wide-spread fallacies of the nineteenth century, and the recent view is that there is no relation between the language a man speaks and his race. "All attempts to correlate linguistic data", says Ripley, "with those derived from the study of physical characteristics are not only illogical and unscientific; they are at the same time impossible and absurd. They involve an entire misconception of the just principles and limitations of scientific research."[122]

Though an earnestly religious man, Bhandarkar does not appear to have subscribed to a belief in an invisible, inscrutable and inexorable force which predetermines everything in man's life, as Sir Jadunath, "who calls the working of this power 'Fate'."[123]

With all these beliefs, biases and suppositions, Bhandarkar was thoroughly objective in his historical writings, and they do not show any influence of these factors.

Sir Ramakrishna Bhandarkar was the father of scientific historical scholarship in the ancient period of Indian history as Sir Jadunath Sarkar was in medieval and early British period. As indicated earlier, Bhandarkar is rigidly objective, matter-of-fact, in his historical writings. There are no observations; he does not look sideways. He has studiedly excluded his personality from his writings. Though it is said that historical writing reflects as much of the period of the writer as of the period on which he

writes, one would vainly search for any glimpses of Bhandarkar in his writings. He would easily have passed muster as a historian in the view of Ranke, who condemned the approach to the study of history from any standpoint of subjective bias, and who, according to Acton, taught us to be critical and colourless.

Bhandarkar's treatment may be said to be a simple cause-and-effect explanation in history in the forms of wars and conquests and dynasties, though it has entailed much labour on his part in collecting bits of information from sources scattered everywhere at random and subjecting them to a critical scrutiny. He has strictly followed the western critical methods, and no flaw can be detected in his writings on that score.

Among Bhandarkar's contemporaries, R. L. Mitra may be said to have followed the same critical methods and the same technique as Bhandarkar. Of the later historians, he exerted direct influence on his son D. R. Bhandarkar, who blossomed forth as an eminent historian, epigraphist, and numismatist, and founded a sort of a school of historians at Calcutta, which turned out several historians of repute.

Though it is very difficult to say who, among modern historians, got their inspiration from or through Bhandarkar, we may state, following Basham, that "Raychaudhuri is...a historian of the School of Bhandarkar, attempting to discover the 'dry truth',[124] and that "much solid work was done along the lines of Bhandarkar." To the names of two scholars (viz. H. C. Raychaudhuri and K. A. Nilakanta Sastri) mentioned by Basham "among many",[125] we may add the names of Kane, Majumdar, Mirashi and Altekar—without any fear of contradiction.

REFERENCES

Note:

The following abbreviations have been used:

CHI: *Comprehensive History of India*, vol. II. Calcutta, 1957.

CW: *Collected Works of R. G. Bhandarkar*, Poona, 1927-1933.

EHD: *Early History of the Deccan*. Edited by G. Yazdani. London, 1960.

EI: *Epigraphia Indica*.

HCIP: *History and Culture of the Indian People*. Edited by R. C. Majumdar. Bombay.

HIPC: *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*. London, 1962 (reprint).

HSI: *History of South India*. By K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. 3rd edition, 1966.

PHAI: *Political History of Ancient India*. By H. C. Raychaudhuri. 5th edition, Calcutta, 1950.

PIHC: *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*.

RT: *Rashtrakutas and their Times*. By A. S. Altekar. Poona, 1934.

SI: *Select Inscriptions*. By D. C. Sircar. 2nd edition, Calcutta, 1965.

54. *HCIP*, V, p. 188.
55. *HSI*, p. 218.
56. *CW*, III, p. 151.
57. *EHD*, p. 531.
58. *HCIP*, V, p. 189.
59. *CW*, III, p. 68.
60. *HCIP*, III, p. 190.
61. *CW*, III, p. 58f.
62. *CW*, III, p. 169.
63. Altekar, *Indian Culture*, II, p. 395f; cf. also *EHD*, p. 20.
64. *CW*, III, p. 91.
65. *HCIP*, IV, p. 7.
66. *JRAS*, 1925, p. 818.
67. *CW*, III, pp. 397-8.
68. The order given by Bhandarkar is: (i) Vonones; (ii) Spalirises; (iii) Azes I; (iv) Azilises; (v) Azes II; and (vi) Maues; whereas the order generally accepted is: (i) Vonones; (ii) Spalirises; (iii) Maues; (iv) Azes I; (v) Azilises; and (vi) Azes II; of course, with a different chronology.
69. *CW*, I, p. 12 n1; Cf. also *SI*, pp. 36, 38 (*hida=iha*).
70. *CW*, I, p. 513.
71. *CHI*, pp. 26 (D. R. Bhandarkar), 500 (Sastri); Sastri, *HSI*, p. 86.
72. *IA*, XIII, pp. 116ff.
73. *CW*, I, p. 253f.
74. *EI*, VIII, pp. 79-80.
75. *CW*, III, p. 381.
76. *CW*, I, pp. 241, 243.
77. *EI*, VIII, p. 67; *SI*, pp. 207ff.
78. *CW*, I, pp. 232, 234.
79. *EI*, VIII, p. 85; *SI*, p. 205.
80. *CW*, I, p. 259.
81. *EI*, VIII, p. 83.
82. *SI*, p. 166 n3.
83. Cf. Sastri, *HSI*, pp. 112f; also *HCIP*, III, p. 269.
84. *CW*, III, p. 203.
85. *CHI*, p. 275 (J. N. Banerjee).
86. *EI*, VIII, pp. 65, 91.
87. *CW*, I, pp. 108, 119; *Patanjala Mahabhashya* (Kielhorn), II, p. 119; *HCIP*, II, p. 107.
88. *CW*, III, p. 38 n1.
89. *CW*, I, p. 368.
90. *CW*, I, pp. 35-6.
91. *CW*, I, p. 413.
92. *CW*, I, p. 520.
93. *CW*, I, pp. 319-20, 426; also cf. 349, 392, 417ff.
94. *CW*, I, p. 362f.
95. *CW*, I, p. 375.
96. *CW*, I, p. 386.
97. *CW*, I, p. 390.
98. *CW*, III, p. 396.
99. *CW*, I, pp. 451-52.
100. *CW*, II, p. 499.
101. *CW*, II, p. 501.
102. *CW*, I, p. 522.
103. *CW*, I, p. 358f.

1. *CW*, III, p. 4.
2. *PIHC*, XXIII, Part 1, p. 11.
3. *CW*, III, p. 185.
4. *CW*, III, p. 190
5. *PIHC*, XXIII, Part 1, p. 11.
6. *PHAI*, p. 549 n3.
7. Vol. X, pp. 19ff (=*CW*, III, pp. 246-56).
8. *CW*, III, pp. 420-2.
9. *CW*, III, pp. 199-213.
10. *CW*, I, pp. 108-208.
11. *CW*, I, pp. 209-13.
12. *CW*, I, pp. 94-101.
13. *CW*, III, pp. 411-19.
14. *CW*, III, p. 44.
15. *CW*, III, p. 47.
16. *CW*, III, p. 28.
17. *PHAI*, p. 496; cf. also *HCIP*, II, p. 205 (Sircar).
18. Cf. *HIPC*, p. 291.
19. *CW*, III, p. 63; I, p. 269.
20. *EI*, VIII, p. 89.
21. *CW*, III, p. 68.
22. *EI*, XXXII, pp. 293-7.
23. *CW*, III, pp. 70, 85.
24. *RT*, p. 28; *EHD*, pp. 190 n1, 212.
25. *EI*, XXXIII, pp. 213-16.
26. *CW*, III, p. 86.
27. *EHD*, p. 258 and n2.
28. *CW*, III, p. 87.
29. *CW*, III, p. 88 n1.
30. *CW*, III, p. 319.
31. *CW*, III, p. 212.
32. *CW*, III, p. 93; cf. *HCIP*, IV, p. 6.
33. *RT*, p. 87 n46.
34. *CW*, III, p. 99 n2.
35. *EHD*, pp. 281, 285.
36. *CW*, III, p. 101.
37. *EI*, XXXII, pp. 45-5.
38. *EI*, XXXII, p. 50.
39. *EHD*, p. 288.
40. *CW*, III, p. 109.
41. *CW*, III, p. 111.
42. *CW*, III, pp. 116ff.
43. *CW*, III, pp. 117, 120; cf. Sastri, *EHD*, pp. 350f; *HSI*, p. 192.
44. *CW*, III, p. 131.
45. *EHD*, p. 520.
46. *EHD*, p. 465, also *HSI*, p. 198.
47. *CW*, III, pp. 139-40.
48. *EHD*, p. 517 n1; also Sircar, *EI*, XXXII, pp. 61-2.
49. *EI*, XXXIV, pp. 32-41.
50. *CW*, III, p. 150.
51. *EHD*, p. 530 n1; also Sastri, *HSI*, p. 199.
52. *CW*, III, p. 150.
53. *EHD*, p. 540.

54. *HCIP*, V, p. 188.
55. *HSI*, p. 218.
56. *CW*, III, p. 151.
57. *EHD*, p. 531.
58. *HCIP*, V, p. 189.
59. *CW*, III, p. 68.
60. *HCIP*, III, p. 190.
61. *CW*, III, p. 58f.
62. *CW*, III, p. 169.
63. Altekar, *Indian Culture*, II, p. 395f; cf. also *EHD*, p. 20.
64. *CW*, III, p. 91.
65. *HCIP*, IV, p. 7.
66. *JRAS*, 1925, p. 818.
67. *CW*, III, pp. 397-8.
68. The order given by Bhandarkar is: (i) Vonones; (ii) Spalirises; (iii) Azes I; (iv) Azilises; (v) Azes II; and (vi) Maues; whereas the order generally accepted is: (i) Vonones; (ii) Spalirises; (iii) Maues; (iv) Azes I; (v) Azilises; and (vi) Azes II; of course, with a different chronology.
69. *CW*, I, p. 12 n1; Cf. also *SI*, pp. 36, 38 (*hida=iha*).
70. *CW*, I, p. 513.
71. *CHI*, pp. 26 (D. R. Bhandarkar), 500 (Sastri); Sastri, *HSI*, p. 86.
72. *IA*, XIII, pp. 116ff.
73. *CW*, I, p. 253f.
74. *EI*, VIII, pp. 79-80.
75. *CW*, III, p. 381.
76. *CW*, I, pp. 241, 243.
77. *EI*, VIII, p. 67; *SI*, pp. 207ff.
78. *CW*, I, pp. 232, 234.
79. *EI*, VIII, p. 85; *SI*, p. 205.
80. *CW*, I, p. 259.
81. *EI*, VIII, p. 83.
82. *SI*, p. 166 n3.
83. Cf. Sastri, *HSI*, pp. 112f; also *HCIP*, III, p. 269.
84. *CW*, III, p. 203.
85. *CHI*, p. 275 (J. N. Banerjee).
86. *EI*, VIII, pp. 65, 91.
87. *CW*, I, pp. 108, 119; *Patanjala Mahabhashya* (Kielhorn), II, p. 119; *HCIP*, II, p. 107.
88. *CW*, III, p. 38 n1.
89. *CW*, I, p. 368.
90. *CW*, I, pp. 35-6.
91. *CW*, I, p. 413.
92. *CW*, I, p. 520.
93. *CW*, I, pp. 319-20, 426; also cf. 349, 392, 417ff.
94. *CW*, I, p. 362f.
95. *CW*, I, p. 375.
96. *CW*, I, p. 386.
97. *CW*, I, p. 390.
98. *CW*, III, p. 396.
99. *CW*, I, pp. 451-52.
100. *CW*, II, p. 499.
101. *CW*, II, p. 501.
102. *CW*, I, p. 522.
103. *CW*, I, p. 358f.

104. *CW*, I, pp. 447, 354.
105. *CW*, I, p. 447.
106. *CW*, I, p. 467.
107. *Early History of India*, 2nd Ed., p. 331.
108. *CW*, I, p. 358.
109. *CW*, I, p. 357; cf. also I, p. 475; I, p. 513.
110. *CW*, I, p. 479.
111. *CW*, II, pp. 518, 534.
112. *CW*, I, p. 356.
113. *CW*, I, p. 475.
114. *CW*, I, p. 445.
115. *CW*, I, p. 446.
116. *CW*, I, pp. 471, 474.
117. *CW*, I, pp. 391f, 421.
118. *CW*, II, p. 537.
119. *History of Europe* (London, 1935), Preface.
120. *CW*, I, p. 393.
121. *CW*, I, p. 390.
122. *The Races of Europe*, p. 454.
123. J. N. Sarkar, *Report of the Seminar* (Santiniketan, 1968), p. 105.
124. *HIPC*, p. 284.
125. *HIPC*, p. 286.

D. R. BHANDARKAR

Dr. A. N. Lahiri

(University of Calcutta)

Son of a distinguished Indologist, Devadatta Ramakrishna Bhandarkar was one of the most eminent scholars of the older school. His lifelong studies covered various branches of Indology. Starting his career as an ethnologist Devadatta soon found himself amidst vigorous activities in the Department of Archaeology, Government of India, where he worked from 1904 to 1917. He was virtually snatched from the Government service by Sir Asutosh Mukherji for the post of Carmichael Professor in the University of Calcutta. He adorned that post for nearly two decades from 1917 to 1936. And even after his retirement he kept himself busy in various Indological pursuits till his death on 30 May, 1950. But well before his demise he happily reaped the harvest of his prolonged toil, and honours were showered on him in profusion by various educational and cultural institutions.

Devadatta Ramakrishna Bhandarkar was born on 19 November, 1875. He grew up in a highly academic atmosphere created by his renowned father Sir Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar. Devadatta passed the B.A. Examination of the Bombay University from the Deccan College, Poona, in 1896, and began studying Law. But destiny conspired to divert the course of his academic life on to a different channel, and he was soon to give up his legal studies. An advertisement for the Bhagwanlal Indraji Gold Medal and Prize attracted his attention, and in course of only about three months he collected his material and completed a thesis entitled, *A Brief Survey of the Ancient Towns and Cities of Maharashtra country in the pre-Mahomedan period, i.e. 1000 A.D.*, which he duly submitted to the Registrar of the Bombay University. The paper, which young Devadatta prepared and of which he did not dare to inform his father, could not, of course, carry off the coveted gold medal, but it was adjudged to be good enough for a prize, as it contained exhaustive and well-presented information. Sir Ramakrishna, when he heard of his son's plight, was both angry and glad—angry because his son submitted a thesis which was not of the required standard and glad because he saw in him a potential Indologist. He asked him to give up Law and devote himself entirely to Indological studies. Consequently, Devadatta went in for the M.A. examination, took up 'Languages', i.e. English and Sanskrit, with optional papers in Pali and Palaeography, corresponding to 'Ancient Indian History and Culture' of the present day, and passed that examination

creditably in 1901. The same year he got an appointment in the Bombay Office of the Census of India, under R. E. Enthoven, I.C.S., whom he immensely helped in writing out chapters III and IV of the Census Report, the former relating to 'Religions and Sects' and the latter to 'Caste and Tribe'.

Bhandarkar soon became the Honorary Assistant Superintendent of the Ethnological Survey of Bombay. Here also he helped Mr. Enthoven, the Superintendent of the Survey, in the preparation of his paper on the *Ahirs*. Besides working on the Ahirs, Bhandarkar wrote papers on the Gurjaras and Guhilots. His article on the Gurjaras was published in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1903. The papers created quite a stir in the academic world and no less a person than A. F. Rudolph Hoernle favourably commented upon them in the pages of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1904. The reading and interpretation of certain dates of the inscriptions of the Gurjaras in his series of *Epigraphic Notes and Questions* and the observations regarding the tribe in his paper entitled 'Gurjaras', as appeared in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. XXI, were instrumental in correcting a lot of wrong ideas about the Gurjaras. As a matter of fact, Bhandarkar was able to prove conclusively that the dates of some three copperplate inscriptions of the Gurjaras read by Kielhorn and Fleet as 100, 155 and 188 of the Harsha era corresponding roughly to 705, 760 and 793 A.D. were in reality 900, 955 and 988 of the Vikrama era corresponding approximately to 843, 898 and 931 A.D. This naturally created a great impact on the history of the Gurjaras and their contemporaries. No sooner did Kielhorn read Bhandarkar's articles than he realised the merit of Bhandarkar's contributions, and he promptly accepted his views in an article published in a German periodical in 1905. Not only this. He sent a copy of the article to Bhandarkar with "To show at once that I have been wrong.—F. K." written on its title-page.

However, all these researches earned for Bhandarkar a great renown. He was appointed the Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji Lecturer of the Bombay University for 1904. The last of the series of Lectures that he delivered there was on 'Foreign Elements in Hindu Population'. It has since attained a classical status.

In the meantime, A. M. Jackson, a highly placed civilian of the Bombay Presidency, who was closely following Bhandarkar's academic activities, offered him two alternative appointments—a lucrative post in the Revenue Department with brilliant prospects and a position in the Department of Archaeology, "where promotion would be doubtful and nomadic life certain". Bhandarkar chose the latter alternative, and consequently joined the Archaeological Department on 20 June, 1904 as Assistant Archaeological Surveyor, Western Circle, to the great surprise of the European officers; for, they could not believe that Bhandarkar,

an Indian, would be able to promote the cause of Archaeology. But Bhandarkar soon proved himself to be quite capable of the type of work he was entrusted with. In the first year as Assistant Surveyor he was to make short abstracts of the inscriptions collected during the previous touring season and take casts and impressions of coins held under the Treasure Trove Act for the office museum of the Western Circle. From June 1905 till 1910 Bhandarkar made extensive tours in the Rajputana region in order to prepare Lists of the Ancient Monuments in Rajputana. Bhandarkar's sincerity of purpose and hard work and the scholarly exposition of his findings were much appreciated by the authorities. His discoveries, regarding the origin of the Lakulisa sect and its bearing on the early history of certain tribes, were specially commented upon.

But in spite of all these there was no material gain for Bhandarkar. He was not even made permanent as Assistant Superintendent. From 1904 to 1907 his service was renewed from year to year, and only in June 1907 he was given a four-year extension of service. There was evidently a motive behind this strange affair: he was not to stand in the way of a certain European officer being promoted to the post of Superintendent after the retirement of Henry Cousens. In fact, Bhandarkar's claim was superseded by the appointment as Superintendent of A. H. Longhurst in 1910. But fortunately for Bhandarkar, Longhurst was transferred to the Southern Circle, Madras, in August 1911, and he was duly promoted as Superintendent, Western Circle. Incidentally, D. R. Bhandarkar was the first Indian to hold that coveted post. It would be highly interesting to follow Bhandarkar's activities in the Archaeological Department as recorded in the pages of the *Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey, Western Circle*, from 1904-5 to 1909-10 as Assistant Superintendent and from 1910-11 to 1917-18 as Superintendent.

In 1911 Bhandarkar was made the co-editor of the *Indian Antiquary* with Sir Richard Temple. His first work as editor was to revise and publish his famous article entitled 'Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population'. Bhandarkar, however, remained the editor of the *Indian Antiquary* till 1922, when he resigned for reasons of health.

On 15 November, 1912 D. R. Bhandarkar was awarded the Sir James Campbell Gold Medal by the Bombay University, and was incidentally the second recipient of the Medal, the first being Sir Aurel Stein, the famous archaeological explorer.

As the Superintendent of Archaeology Bhandarkar excavated at sites, of which one around 'Kham Baba' or the famous Heliodorous Pillar at Besnagar and another in the heart of that ancient town, yielded startling results. Incidentally, Heliodorous, who was a devout worshipper of Vasudeva and who raised that pillar in honour of him, was the ambassador of King Antialcidas of Taxila to the court of the then Vidisa king Bhagabhadra. Bhandarkar unearthed on the north of the Vasudeva

shrine a solid railing of a design which was till then unknown elsewhere. Then, one of the two wedges, when sent for analysis at Sheffield, proved to be a piece of genuine steel. This was a remarkable discovery, since the use of steel in India in the pre-Muhammadan days was then undreamt of, and Sir Robert Hadfield made a special mention of it before the Faraday Society on 23 November, 1914. The third startling discovery of Bhandarkar at that site was lime-mortar in a structure of the Maurya (*sic.* Sunga) period, rivalling that of the Romans. Bhandarkar made the fourth interesting discovery at the second site at Besnagar. It was in the form of fire-bricks picked from *yajna-kundas* or sacrificial pits which were dug up about the second century B.C.

In 1917 Bhandarkar was appointed the Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji Lecturer for the second time.

The eminent scholarship of Bhandarkar attracted the attention of Bengal's greatest educationist, Sir Asutosh Mukherji. He considered Bhandarkar to be the most suitable candidate for the newly created post of Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture in the University of Calcutta, and practically snatched him from the Archaeological Department against stiff opposition from the authorities. D. R. Bhandarkar finally joined the University of Calcutta on 1 July, 1917; but according to a bilateral agreement he was to hold simultaneously the post of Officer-in-charge, Archaeological Section, Indian Museum, Calcutta. Bhandarkar held that additional Indian Museum post till 1920. As Carmichael Professor Bhandarkar delivered three series of lectures in the University of Calcutta. The first series of Lectures was delivered in 1918 on 'Ancient History of India, from 650 B.C. to 325 B.C.' The second series delivered in 1921 was on 'Ancient Indian Numismatics', while the third series relating to 'Asoka' was delivered in 1923. In 1925 Professor Bhandarkar was appointed the Manindra Chandra Nandi Lecturer of the Benares Hindu University. The series of Lectures that Bhandarkar delivered there was on 'Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity'.

He became a Fellow of the Calcutta University and remained so till his retirement as Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture in 1936. He was conferred the Honorary Degree of Ph.D. in 1921 at a special convocation of the Calcutta University along with a few other intellectual luminaries.

Bhandarkar was nominated a Member of the Board of Trustees, Indian Museum, Calcutta, in place of Lord Carmichael, the first Governor of Bengal. He became Acting Treasurer and Acting Secretary of the Indian Museum several times and was the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Indian Museum from 1925 to 1927.

He was associated with the Royal Asiatic Society throughout his long career in Calcutta. Professor Bhandarkar was elected a Fellow of the Society in 1918. He was its Philological Secretary for five years from 1920 to 1925.

After rendering nearly twenty years' service in the Calcutta University Bhandarkar retired as the Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture in 1936. He was elected the President of the Cultural Conference held in Calcutta in the same year. He became the President of the Allahabad Session of the Indian History Congress two years later. Bhandarkar then delivered the Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1938-39 at the University of Madras on 'Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture'.

Thereafter, honorary membership and fellowship poured upon Bhandarkar in profusion. He was elected Honorary Fellow of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in 1943. He became Honorary Correspondent of the Archaeological Department, Government of India, and a corresponding Member of the Indian Historical Records Commission. He was also elected Honorary Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal as well as of the Indian Research Institute, Calcutta. The Calcutta Historical Society also elected him an Honorary Fellow. He was the Joint Editor of the *Indian Culture* for some years. Bhandarkar was awarded the Dr. Bimala Churn Law Gold Medal by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal for his most important contributions to ancient Indian history and archaeology.

Besides delivering a number of endowment lectures in various universities, D. R. Bhandarkar contributed a large number of papers to various cultural journals, the most important from the standpoint of history being those published in the *Epigraphia Indica.*

Bhandarkar lived up to a ripe old age of 75 years, and with his death on 30 May, 1950 ended an academic career, which was unique in many respects and full of activities for half a century.

Major works of D. R. Bhandarkar constitute his Lectures delivered in various universities of India throughout his most active career. But no less important are his numerous papers published in a number of cultural journals. His service in the Ethnological Survey of Bombay created in him a live interest in the study of ancient tribes like the Ahirs, Gurjaras, and Guhilots. That very interest culminated in his famous lecture on 'Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population'. But Bhandarkar's formal education was responsible mainly for his love for epigraphical records and monetary issues of the past. All these pursuits again led him to the study of history and its various aspects, such as social and cultural trends, polity and administration.

Bhandarkar's interest in epigraphical research manifested itself even before he passed the M.A. examination in 1901. For, about this time he started writing articles on inscriptions simultaneously in the *Epigraphia Indica* and the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.* His two initial articles entitled (1) 'The Nausari Copperplate Charter of the Gurjara Rashtrakuta Prince Karkka I, dated 738', and (2) 'A Kushan

Stone Inscription and the Question about the Origin of the Saka Era', were published in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. XX. The latter article was favourably reviewed by the French savant A. Barth in the *Journal of the French Institute*. To the next volume he contributed a series of *Epigraphical Notes and Questions* as well as his paper on 'Gurjaras'. These were instrumental in correcting a lot of wrong ideas about the Gurjaras.

By this time Bhandarkar joined the Bombay Office of the Census of India, 1901, and became the Honorary Assistant Superintendent of the Ethnological Survey of Bombay, and got himself involved in the study of ancient tribes like the Ahirs, Gurjaras and Guhilots. While working on these tribes Bhandarkar realised how these and other foreign people penetrated into India, ruled over different parts of the country and finally merged into its vast population. And these findings were very ably incorporated into the last of the Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji Lectures, 1904. In volume XXII of the same journal was published Bhandarkar's interesting paper on 'Lakulisa', the founder of the religious sect of the same name.

By 1904, when he joined the Archaeological Survey, Western Circle, he became a prolific writer, specially on Epigraphical matters. In the very first year of his service he was entrusted with making short abstracts of inscriptions collected by the officers of the Circle and taking casts of coins received from Treasure Troves. For the next six or seven years also he got ample opportunities in examining numerous inscriptions and coins in course of his extensive tours in various parts of the Rajputana region, and made full use of them. This will be evident from Bhandarkar's 'Annual Reports' published in the *Progress Reports of the Archaeological Survey, Western Circle*, from 1904-5 to 1910-11.

In the meantime (since 1900) Bhandarkar began contributing articles to the *Epigraphia Indica*, which was then published as a 'Supplement of the *Indian Antiquary*' and a 'Record of the Archaeological Survey of India'. It is however interesting to note that many of the inscriptions Bhandarkar published related to the medieval rulers of the Gujrat-Rajputana region, where he toured extensively in course of his official work. Volume VI of the *Epigraphia Indica* (1900-1) incorporated two of his articles, viz. 'Akas Plates of the Yuvaraja Govinda III, Saka 692' and 'Plates of Dantivarman of Gujarat, Saka 789'. Volume VIII included 'Dhulia Plates of Karkaraja, Saka 701', while the next volume contained Bhandarkar's five articles, viz. (1) Two Grants of Indra III, Saka 836, (2) Vasantagarh Inscriptions of Varmalata, Vikrama 682, (3) Daulatabad Plates of Rashtrakuta Sankaragama, Saka 715, (4) Buchkala Inscription of Nagabhata, Vikrama 872, and (5) Ghatiyala Inscription of Kakkuka, Vikrama 918. Volume XI of the *Epigraphia Indica* included an exhaustive article of Bhandarkar, viz. 'The Chahamanas of Marwar' which dealt with as many as 28 inscriptions and provided an Appendix on 'History of—

the Marwar Chahamanas'. In volume XIII of the same celebrated epigraphical journal appeared 'Chatau Inscription of Baladitya, Gupta Year 407'. All these epigraphical publications, it is needless to say, revealed quite a considerable amount of hitherto unknown and useful facts about the history of Early Medieval India.

But Bhandarkar's preoccupations in the Archaeological Survey as Superintendent, his routine work in the Calcutta University as Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture and his duties in the Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum as Officer-in-charge kept him otherwise busy for nearly ten years and it was not possible for him to do any special work on epigraphy. Thus, it was only in 1925-26 that Bhandarkar could contribute a paper in the *Epigraphia Indica* (volume XVII), which related to the highly important 'Sanjan Plates of Amoghavarsha I, Saka 793'. From that time till 1935-36, however, Bhandarkar did some valuable work in the field of epigraphy. He published as many as six inscriptions in the *Epigraphia Indica,* volumes XIX/XII: (1) Jejuri Plates of Vinayaditya, Saka 609, (2) Mathura Pillar inscription of Chandragupta II, Gupta Year 61, (3) Maurya Brahmi Inscription of Mahasthana, (4) Silahara Cave Inscriptions, (5) Jethua Plates of Rashtrakuta queen Silamahadevi, Saka 700, and (6) Hathi-bada Brahmi Inscription at Nagari. Then after a lapse of about ten years, when he was busy with other academic activities, Bhandarkar published a number of important inscriptions. Of them, Mathura pillar inscription and the Brahmi inscription from Mahasthan are of much greater importance. The former proves that Lakuli, the founder of the Pasupata sect, flourished in the first quarter of the second century A.D., while the latter reveals the fact that even in the third-fourth century B.C. adequate measures were taken against famine conditions in the remote Mahasthan area (Bogula District) which evidently formed part of the Maurya empire.

By far the most important epigraphical work of Bhandarkar consisted of the *List of the Inscriptions of Northern India written in Brahmi and its Derivative Scripts from about 300 A. D.* Bhandarkar took more than five years to complete the work, which is of immense reference value to all researchers of history of the period concerned. It was serially published as an Appendix to the *Epigraphia Indica,* volumes XIX-XXIII (1927-28 to 1935-36). However, as noted above, Bhandarkar's major works constituted various endowment lectures that he delivered in different universities of India. Five series of such lectures have been published in book form.

He delivered three series of Carmichael Lectures in the University of Calcutta. Based on original research, these lectures were delivered in a very lucid manner and were highly interesting to both scholars and laymen. The first series of Carmichael Lectures delivered in 1918 related to the ancient history of India from 650 B.C. to 325 B.C. and consists of

four lectures. The first one on 'Aryan Colonisation of Southern India' throws important light on the historical geography of ancient India. The second lecture entitled 'Political History' traces for the first time the gradual evolution of imperialism in Northern India—from sixteen Mahajanapadas or Great States to four greater ones, which ultimately coalesced into one great empire (of Magadha). The third lecture, which relates to Administration, is divided into two parts, one dealing with 'Literature on Hindu Polity' and the other dealing with some of the Hindu conceptions of Monarchy. The fourth lecture, which also relates to Administration, has for its theme 'Sangha Form of Political Government', which is but one of many forms of non-monarchical government prevalent in ancient India. These lectures still remain the standard work on the subject, supplying useful material to research scholars.

The second series of Carmichael Lectures delivered in 1921 consists of five lectures which deal with Numismatics or the Science of Coinage, which was, from the very beginning, chosen as a subject for study in the M.A. examination in Ancient Indian History and Culture of the University of Calcutta. The first lecture, entitled 'Importance of the Study of Numismatics', shows how coins help us in reconstructing the political, social, religious and administrative history, besides supplying us with material on historical geography. He also stressed in this lecture the great importance of numismatics as a veritable source of ancient Indian history, and the vast scope of research that numismatics presents before a scholar was probably for the first time pointed out by Bhandarkar. The second lecture on 'Antiquity of Coinage in India' traces the evolution of coinage in India and shows that Indian coinage evolved on indigenous lines, owing its origin to no foreign currency. The third lecture entitled 'Karshapana: its Nature and Antiquity' deals with various aspects of the most ancient form of Indian coinage, referred to as karshapana in ancient literature, and now known as the 'punch-marked' currency and discovered in thousands from all parts of the country. The fourth lecture on 'Science of Coinage in Ancient India' discusses various aspects of the coins of the past, viz., the metal, shape, size, technique of manufacture, issuing authority, etc. The fifth lecture entitled 'History of Coinage in Ancient India' gives us a connected account of the origin and development of the system of Indian currency from the earliest times. These lectures of Bhandarkar are incidentally amongst the pioneer works for Indian scholars and have gone a long way in popularising numismatics.

The third series of Carmichael Lectures are on 'Asoka', and Bhandarkar delivered them in 1923. They consist of eight lectures: (1) Asoka and his Early Life, (2) Asoka's Empire and Administration, (3) Asoka as a Buddhist, (4) Asoka's Dhamma, (5) Asoka as a Missionary, (6) Social and Religious Life from Asoka's Monuments, (7) Asoka's place in History, and (8) Asoka's Inscriptions (with detailed annotations).

These lectures have created for themselves a unique position amongst the numerous writings on Asoka. They enable us to visualise the greatness of Asoka both as a benevolent and pious monarch and as a mighty administrator with all his frailties and his noble aspirations. The approach of the numerous earlier scholars of Europe who worked on Asoka was mainly from the standpoint of epigraphy, while Bhandarkar's studies were based on a critical evaluation of all the historical material gleaned from those records. His wide aquaintance with ancient literature benefited him immensely in this respect and enabled him to interpret facts in a more critical way and examine various points of historical interest. His critical analysis of the inscriptions of Asoka has yielded unexpected results, and, even after the publications of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol. I, by E. Hultzsch, the value of Bhandarkar's *Asoka* has not been lessened. In fact, it still forms one of the standard works on Asoka. In 1925 Bhandarkar delivered the Manindra Chandra Nandi Lectures at the Banaras Hindu University, the topic being 'Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity'. Even though K. P. Jayaswal had earlier written on the subject, Bhandarkar treated it more thoroughly and scientifically. This series consists of six lectures. The first lecture on 'Hindu Science of Politics' revealed that ancient India had considerable contributions to Political Science, which was known as *Dandaniti* or *Rajaniti* and elaborately dealt with in various ancient texts like the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya. Bhandarkar discussed in the second lecture the 'Date of Kautilya'. He criticised in this connection some European Sanskritists as well as his own father Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who held the view that the *Arthasastra* was a late work of the third century A. D. and that there was no such person as Kautilya. He adduced cogent arguments to prove that the *Arthasastra* was really composed in the fourth century B.C. by Kautilya, the prime minister of Chandragupta Maurya. In the third lecture on 'Hindu Conception of the State' Bhandarkar discussed the traditional idea of the seven constituents of a state, viz. (1) *Svamin* (the Sovereign), (2) *Amatya* (the Official), (3) *Janapada* or Rashtra (the territory), (4) *Durga* (the Fort), (5) *Kosa* (the Treasury), (6) *Danda* or *Bala* (the Army), and (7) *Mitra* (the Ally). Bhandarkar then compared this Hindu conception of the nature of a state with that of modern times. In the fourth lecture Bhandarkar discussed 'Different Types of States' prevailing in ancient India, and differentiated one from the other. In this connection he showed how various forms of royal titles denoted various forms of states their holders ruled. Thus, there was Samrajya for a Samrat, Bhaujya for Bhoja, Svarajya for a Svarat, Vairajya for a Vairat, Rajya for a Rajan, and so on. He then showed that the idea of imperialism was conceived even before the time of Chandragupta Maurya, and considered various types of monarchical as well as (tribal) oligarchical (Sangha or Gana) forms of government. In his fifth lecture on the 'Origin of the State' Bhandarkar

discussed the two main theories, viz., the Social Contract theory and that of the Divine Origin of Kingship. He showed how far those theories are traceable in ancient Hindu Law books. The sixth and the final lecture deals with 'the Nature and End of the Hindu State'. He enumerated the duties that the authorities of a Hindu state of ancient times were expected to perform. Bhandarkar delivered the Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1938-39, at the Madras University, the subject being 'Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Culture'. The series consisted of six lectures. In the first lecture Bhandarkar discussed the implication of the terms 'Arya, Dasa and Dasyu' and the gradual evolution of their meanings. In the second lecture he defined what was meant by 'Aryan culture', while in the third and fourth ones he discussed the meaning of the term 'Aryanisation'. In the fifth lecture he dealt with 'Brahmanisation' and showed that the Brahmanas were not less enterprising than the Buddhists in proselytising zeal and were very much eager to disseminate the Brahmanic culture based on the *varnasramadharma*. In his sixth lecture entitled 'Indianisation', he showed how the foreign Aryan culture was assimilated by the Indians and that in the process of assimilation some constituents of the foreign Aryan culture were imbibed by the Indians, while some were discarded at a later date when the old civilisation asserted itself.

The methodology followed by D. R. Bhandarkar is typical of the older school of Indian scholars. He relied, like most of his Indian contemporaries with a background of Sanskritic studies, more on literary evidence than on anything else. He believed, sometimes blindly perhaps, in the inherent greatness and higher antiquity of Indian culture and civilisation. And in order to prove this he would always put forth his arguments to combat those of the European scholars, many of whom would believe that Indian history started from the invasion of Alexander the Great in the latter half of the fourth century B.C. and most of the artistic and cultural activities of the Indians were influenced by those of the foreigners. It seems Bhandarkar took upon himself the very task of disproving this myth. With a thorough acquaintance of ancient Indian literature and with a good knowledge of archaeological findings Bhandarkar could present his case in a better way than many European Indologists.

Bhandarkar thus could easily show that the Indians did not derive their alphabet and script from foreigners. He also proved beyond doubt that the Indians evolved their own coinage independently of any foreign influence. But in this case, he seems to have gone too far in assigning a very high antiquity to Indian coinage. Since the Vedic literature makes repeated mention of terms like *nishka* and *satamana*, Bhandarkar would believe that coins in the forms of *nishkas* and *satamana* were freely used in the Vedic period. But researches on Indian numismatics have not

yet been able to substantiate the view of Bhandarkar. In the first place it is difficult to believe that terms like *nishka* and *satamana* denoted coined money as early as the Vedic period; and in the second place, no extant specimens of such ancient currency have so far come to light. In fact, we have not yet discovered any form of Indian currency older than the so-called bent-bar, cup-shaped or punch-marked pieces, and on archaeological grounds these most ancient coins of India can only be placed in the sixth, at the earliest in the seventh century B.C.

However, Bhandarkar, with a mastery of Sanskrit and Prakrit and a critical historical acumen, has interpreted various aspects of Indian culture and civilisation in a highly satisfactory manner. In fact, no Indian or European before Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar had made an all-pervading study of Indian history and culture in a scientific and critical way as he has done.

S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR

DR. G. S. DIKSHIT

(Karnatak University, Dharwar)

S. K. AIYANGAR was born on the 15th of April, 1871, in the village of Sakkottai (Shajikot), the ancient Raghunathapura, a suburb of Kumbhakonam. His elder brother educated him at Bangalore. He studied in the Central College, Bangalore, to get a degree in Physics. Since he did not get a distinction in that subject, he devoted himself to post-graduate studies in Mathematics, while working in a school in Bangalore itself. But after he was transferred to a teacher's post first at Chikmagalur and then at Kolar, in Mysore State, he had to forsake the study of Mathematics for that of History and took his M.A. degree in it in 1899, when he was twenty-eight.[1]

Just when he was about to become the Headmaster of a High School, his M.A. thesis on the History of Mysore under the Wodeyars was published in the *Madras Review* of May 1900, and this enabled him to become a Lecturer in History in the Central College. In 1904 he became a Professor of English in the same institution.[2]

When the Madras University created a chair of Indian History and Archaeology, it negotiated with the Government of Mysore for the loan of Aiyangar's services and appointed him to that post in 1914.[3] He held this post till 1929.[4] In 1919 he was appointed Reader in the Calcutta University and delivered his lectures on some contributions of South India to Indian culture. The same University conferred on him an Honorary Doctorate.[5]

Before describing his plan of work as Professor of Indian History in the University of Madras, it may be proper to find out how Aiyangar came to develop interest in this subject. Ever since 1889, that is when Aiyangar was eighteen years old, he had been in contact with the great epigraphist, V. Venkayya, who was his neighbour and used to discuss with him problems connected with Tamil literature suggested by the works of Professor Sundaram Pillai. He next came under the influence of E. Hultzsch, who was just then publishing the South Indian Inscriptions along with Venkayya. Stimulated by their example, Aiyangar wrote two papers on Chola Ascendancy and Chola Administration which received praise from Hultzsch who advised him to give real scope to his intelligence in interpreting the historical value of inscriptions after their publication by the Department of Epigraphy.[6]

Aiyangar showed great courage when he decided, early in his career,

in 1896, to devote his abilities to historical and archaeological research, because it was a time when a young scholar taking up such studies had little prospect of material reward. Nor did he have any aids to study by way of a library or the stimulus of fellow workers. Only courage sustained by a genuine love of learning could have enabled him to remain faithful to his decision for eighteen years, that is up to 1914, when he was appointed to the Professorship of Indian History in the University of Madras.[7]

On assumption of the new office, he chalked out three lines of work. In the first place, he used to deliver every year a series of advanced lectures to the students of the honours classes, in the main, on chosen topics of Indian History. The first of the advanced lectures concerned Vijayanagar and in the coming years practically the whole of the Hindu period down to the foundation of Vijayanagar was dealt with in these lectures.[8]

Secondly, he supervised and trained University Research students. Under this plan, he guided, during his fifteen years of office, the work of four research students allotted to him. The works of these students included *Sources of Vijayanagar History* by A. Rangaswami Saraswati, the *History of the Nayakas of Madura* by Professor R. Sathianathaiyyar, the *History of the Pallavas of Kanchi* by Mr. R. Gopalan and *Hindu Administrative Institutions* by V. R. R. Dikshitar.[9]

Thirdly, the Professor himself engaged in research work and published the results whenever ripe.[10]

The major works of Aiyangar are: 1. Two volumes of his collected works known as *Ancient India* and *South Indian History and Culture.* These include most of the important papers on Indian History and Culture wirtten by Aiyangar from time to time. These selected papers are divided into two parts: (i) papers on general Indian History up to 1300, both North and South, included in the first part which is issued under the name, *Ancient India*; and (ii) the other papers of the same useful character, but relating to a later period of South Indian History mainly, and a number of miscellaneous papers bearing upon topics of Indian Culture, forming another part in continuation, under the caption *South Indian History and Culture.* 2. *Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture.* 3. *South India and Her Mukammadan Invaders.* 4. *Manimekhalai in its Historical Setting.* 5. *The Evolution of Hindu Administrative Institutions in South India.* 6. *Sewell's Historical Inscriptions of South India.* 7. *The Parama Samhita of the Pancharatra.* 8. *A History of Tirupati* in two volumes.

His work called *Ancient India*, being the first volume of his collected works, incorporates his lectures to his students on Ancient India, on such topics as Studies in Gupta History, the Hun Problem in Indian History, the Vakatakas and their place in Indian History and the Gurjara Empire in North India. With regard to the Professor's contributions to the History of North India, it may be stated that they incorporate all the latest re-

the age of the Pallavas and is assignable to the period A.D. 300 to 900.[12]

It was Aiyangar again who fixed the date of the Kalabhra interregnum in South Indian history from A.D. 300 onwards. The Kalabhras were active in South India up to A.D. 700 or so. They were intruders from the North into the Tamil country and created an interregnum in Pandya rule. It is very likely that the Sangam order of society may have been destroyed by them.[13]

Again the credit for giving a more satisfactory account of the origin of the Pallavas goes to Aiyangar. Previous to him they were equated with the foreign Pallavas. According to Aiyangar, they were a dynasty of officers of the Satavahanas, probably related to them and they conquered the Kanchi region. When the Satavahana dynasty broke up, they apparently set up independently and founded the new dynasty of the Pallavas, as distinct from the older chieftains, the Tondamans of the region. They promoted the religions, culture and language of the North, because they had imbibed them from the Satavahanas.[14] The latest writer Dr. D. C. Sircar supports Aiyangar's theory in his account of the Pallavas in *The Classical Age*.

As regards the Cholas, his account of them in his collected works (volume I) is still very readable (nobody has given a better description of the working of their self-governing local bodies). Though later research has disproved some of his identifications of places in the Bengal expedition of Rajendra Chola Gangaikonda, he was the first Indian historian to describe the maritime relations, friendly and otherwise, between the Cholas and the Sailendra empire in Malaya and Sumatra.

His work *South India and her Muhammadan Invaders* covers the period from the decline of the Cholas and the Hoysalas to the rise of Vijayanagar. With regard to this work S. A. Khan said as follows:

"His brilliant work...has introduced an entirely new conception in our interpretation of Mediaeval India. By applying his solid commonsense, minute knowledge of the geography of Southern India and enormous industry, he has reconstructed the history of the thirteenth and fourteenth century India and removed numerous misunderstandings and misconceptions."[15]

In this work, Aiyangar emphasised the heroic efforts of the Hoysalas and the Kakatiyas and their feudatory chieftains to save South India from the effects of the Muslim invasions.

His contributions to Vijayanagar history are next in importance only to those of Sewell and H. Krishna Sastri. If Sewell reconstructed the *Forgotten Empire* with the help of the Persian and Portuguese and archaeological sources and Krishna Sastri added to them inscriptional sources, Aiyangar, with the help of his student, A. Rangaswami Saraswati, collected casual references to Vijayanagar history in non-historical litera-

searches up to the moment of writing and must have served admirably the purpose for which they were intended.

His contributions to South Indian History and Culture are in a class by themselves and they are spread all over his writings. His Readership lectures to the Calcutta University entitled *Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture* contain in one place his main contributions to the study of South Indian Culture. They may be summarised thus: South Indian Culture has a character of its own despite the interaction between the North and the South. It is possible to distinguish the special features of the South thus:

(1) South India presents today Brahmin orthodoxy in its *Vaidik* form, its chief features being performance of ritualistic sacrifices and cultivation of learning and its propagation.

(2) Modern Hinduism is the result of ritualistic Brahmanism with the addition of theism which was originally Northern but developed more fully in the South, as the cult of *Bhakti*.

(3) Along with the notion of *Bhakti* or devotion to a personal God is *Tantrism*—worship offered by means of mystical signs and formulae. Andhra instead of Tamilnad was probably responsible for this.

(4) In the spread of Indian culture and the expansion of Indian commerce, the former in the East and the latter both in the East and the West, the share of the South was considerable.

(5) In administration, particularly local administration, which was fully developed under the Cholas and also in central administration, the South shows a distinctive character though the general notions were the same both in the North and in the South and these ideas continued right up to the British days in the South and hence the *Fifth Report* had to study it separately.

(6) The South has preserved Indian religions and learning better than the North. The conservation of both was due to the Empire of Vijayanagar, the supersession of which empire by the Muhammadans was a short parenthesis in the history of the general development of religion and culture in South India, In the North, they were subject to great pressure and unavoidable modifications by the impact of Islam which came with the Muhammadan invasions.[11]

Coming to his contributions to South Indian History, there is no field from the earliest to the British periods where his conclusions can be ignored even now.

The chronology which he and a few others have fixed for Tamil literature and history has been more or less accepted. The main features of this scheme are: (i) Sangam literature is of a pre-Pallava character and as such referable to the early centuries of the Christian era; (ii) the literature, the typical representatives of which are the Tevaram and Tiruvoymoli of the saints of the Saivas and Vaishnavas, belongs to

the age of the Pallavas and is assignable to the period A.D. 300 to 900.[12]

It was Aiyangar again who fixed the date of the Kalabhra interregnum in South Indian history from A.D. 300 onwards. The Kalabhras were active in South India up to A.D. 700 or so. They were intruders from the North into the Tamil country and created an interregnum in Pandya rule. It is very likely that the Sangam order of society may have been destroyed by them.[13]

Again the credit for giving a more satisfactory account of the origin of the Pallavas goes to Aiyangar. Previous to him they were equated with the foreign Pallavas. According to Aiyangar, they were a dynasty of officers of the Satavahanas, probably related to them and they conquered the Kanchi region. When the Satavahana dynasty broke up, they apparently set up independently and founded the new dynasty of the Pallavas, as distinct from the older chieftains, the Tondamans of the region. They promoted the religions, culture and language of the North, because they had imbibed them from the Satavahanas.[14] The latest writer Dr. D. C. Sircar supports Aiyangar's theory in his account of the Pallavas in *The Classical Age*.

As regards the Cholas, his account of them in his collected works (volume I) is still very readable (nobody has given a better description of the working of their self-governing local bodies). Though later research has disproved some of his identifications of places in the Bengal expedition of Rajendra Chola Gangaikonda, he was the first Indian historian to describe the maritime relations, friendly and otherwise, between the Cholas and the Sailendra empire in Malaya and Sumatra.

His work *South India and her Muhammadan Invaders* covers the period from the decline of the Cholas and the Hoysalas to the rise of Vijayanagar. With regard to this work S. A. Khan said as follows:

"His brilliant work...has introduced an entirely new conception in our interpretation of Mediaeval India. By applying his solid commonsense, minute knowledge of the geography of Southern India and enormous industry, he has reconstructed the history of the thirteenth and fourteenth century India and removed numerous misunderstandings and misconceptions."[15]

In this work, Aiyangar emphasised the heroic efforts of the Hoysalas and the Kakatiyas and their feudatory chieftains to save South India from the effects of the Muslim invasions.

His contributions to Vijayanagar history are next in importance only to those of Sewell and H. Krishna Sastri. If Sewell reconstructed the *Forgotten Empire* with the help of the Persian and Portuguese and archaeological sources and Krishna Sastri added to them inscriptional sources, Aiyangar, with the help of his student, A. Rangaswami Saraswati, collected casual references to Vijayanagar history in non-historical litera-

ture in Sanskrit, Telugu and Kannada. It is with these Indian sources that Aiyangar was able to understand the character and significance of the empire, about which he wrote eloquently in more than one place. The Madras University continued this work and produced three more volumes entitled *Further Sources of Vijayanagar History* edited by Professors K. S. Nilakanta Sastry and N. Venkataramanayya.

Not only has he fixed the character and significance of this empire as the preservation of Hindu independence and culture, he has contributed to every aspect of its history. He holds that the founders were the officers of the Hoysalas;[16] he has contributed to the unravelling of the confusion caused by four monarchs who succeeded one another, all of them having almost similar names like Narasimha, Narasa and Vira Narasimha.[17] It is in his pages that we find the best account of the glorious reign of Krishnadevaraya[18] and also of the battle of Talikota or Rakshasa-Tangdi.[19]

Aiyangar hailed from Sakkottai which is an abbreviated form of Shahjikot or the fort built by Shahji. It is no wonder that he was interested in Shahji's conquest of the South. There is a controversy as to who was responsible for conquering Karnatak—the Muslim generals of Bijapur or Shahji who was also in the service of Bijapur. Jadunath Sarkar says that the popular Maratha tradition that he was the leading general or conqueror of Mysore finds a complete refutation in the authentic historical sources (Persian and Jesuit). It appears that these sources prove that Shahji was not the supreme army chief, nor even the commander of an independent division. Aiyangar believes in the Hindu sources like *Siva Bharat, Radhamadhava-Vilasachampu* and the Brihadisvara temple inscription—all of which claim for Shahji the credit for the conquest of the South. The latter view is substantiated by the colonisation of Maratha families, in Karnatak and the South, which would not have been possible but for Shahji's campaigns.[20]

It is not only to political history that he devoted his scholarship. The Sir William Meyer Lectures that he delivered in 1930 described the evolution of Hindu Administrative Institutions in South India and concluded that Hindu Monarchy, though autocratic in an emergency, "satisfied the exacting demands even of a pure and complete democracy not only in form but more completely in spirit."

Nor can we ignore his researches into religious history. One of his early works traced the early history of Vaishnavism in South India and his last major work was the *History of Tirupati* in two volumes. The last one is a model of its kind. From scanty material as can be gathered from the Sangam literature, Puranas, works of Srivaishnava alvars and acharyas, *Venkatachala Itihasa* and inscriptions, the author, himself a Srivaishnava, has produced an impartial account of a shrine which at various stages came under the influence of Jaina, Bauddha and Saiva cult before it became and

continues to be the foremost Srivaishnava shrine but equally popular with the rest of the Hindu community.

In his preface to his *History of Tirupati*, Aiyangar describes it thus: "I have made use of all these sources of information with the care that a work like this deserves and have adopted deliberately the method of letting the sources speak as far as they could, as in a controversial matter like this, it is much the best thing to set out the facts clearly and place them upon an indubitable footing, quite distinct from such inferences that one may have to deduce from these facts.... The facts are there quite distinctly stated followed by such inferences I have been enabled to draw therefrom."

He was every inch a self-made man. He graduated in physics. He took his M.A. degree in History and taught for some years all kinds of subjects in schools before he became Professor of History in Madras.

He studied the Sanskrit language with great assiduity and care and attained a very high degree of proficiency in it. In the Gaikwad Oriental Series, he edited a rare Sanskrit work—*Parama Samhita*, with a very learned introduction and a perfect translation of the text in English.

His introduction to *Manimekhalai in its Historical Setting* (the work for which he received the Great Silver Medal by the Institut Historique et Heraldique) reveals a profound knowledge of the various systems of Hindu philosophy, not the scrappy knowledge which most people get by reading imperfect translations of the original texts.

He placed the ideal of every writer of History on a very high pedestal. It should never serve the purpose of propaganda even for noble purposes. He wrote: "We have no right whatever to make History subserve our purposes, however noble they may be in themselves and the value of a study of History is lost completely for good and for evil by the slightest interference with the recording of its actual course. For one example, teachers of history have been admonished to teach history leaving out of it altogether all that would tend to promote sectarian fanaticism. An effort at abolishing what would promote fanaticism is certainly a good thing and the way to teach it is not to remove from history the acts of fanaticism and fanatical personalities who played their part in history. The plainest way of teaching the youth to put an end to fanaticism in their convictions and character is not to tell the lying tale that people were never fanatics, that there were no fanatics before us and no acts of fanaticism were perpetrated in history. The right way to proceed is directly and fully to point out the fanatical acts and those influences which were responsible for the perpetration of fanatical deeds and expound the dire consequences to human society that these actually brought. It is by convincing people of the evil consequences of a bad act that fanaticism should be removed and the evil removed by an act of conviction and not by an act of smooth glossing over or abolishing the state-

ment of their occurrence, by perpetrating lies which ought not to be the function of history."[21]

Aiyangar believed that foreigners could not understand Indian literature fully and explain it satisfactorily as European savants of the first rank often admitted. He pointed out that a specialised study like that of the Veda itself revealed that while the European study of it had certainly made the meaning of words clear, a similar claim could not be advanced with truth in respect of the understanding of the ideas, the allusions and all that made it literature.[22]

Aiyangar also believed that our studies had reached a stage when comprehensive reconstruction seemed called for and could be undertaken with the possibility of successful completion.[23] The Indian History Congress set up a body with Aiyangar as Chairman of the coordinating committee to evolve a comprehensive scheme of writing Indian History. And before he passed away he contributed chapters to a similar scheme launched by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.

In addition to being a member of the Mysore Education Service in the early part of his career and Professor of History in the middle part and also after retirement, Aiyangar took his full share in public activities like founding learned societies or being associated with them or editing journals. One of the earliest institutions, with the founding of which he was actively connected, was the Mythic Society of Bangalore. He was its first secretary, and after continuing in that position for some years, he worked as the editor of its quarterly journal for five years. The best way to find out how active a life he led is to go through the pages of this journal. He delivered many lectures under its auspices, he presided over some, and when he was not doing either, he commented upon the lectures of others. His contributions in all these capacities are still worth perusal.

The next journal with which he was associated was the *Indian Antiquary*. He held the office of its Joint Editor for more than ten years along with Sir Richard Temple, S. M. Edwardes and E. A. W. Oldham.

But it is as the editor of the *Journal of Indian History* that he will be long remembered. Shafaat Ahmed Khan started it in 1921, but could not continue it after the third volume. Aiyangar took it up and struggled hard for five years and secured a recognised position for it, but its finances continued to cause anxiety. Many times later on, Aiyangar was forced to consider seriously whether it would not be worthwhile closing it down. After a severe struggle each time, he continued the good work, notwithstanding the great pecuniary sacrifices which it involved. The only reward which he got was the appreciation of competent critics and the ungrudging co-operation of his trusted colleagues on the editorial staff, C. S. Srinivasachariar and V. R. R. Dikshitar;[24] until at last, he was able to persuade the Kerala University to take it over and relieve him of a great responsibility.

The Indian Historical Records Commission, the All-India Oriental Conference and the Indian History Congress were some of the institutions to whose proceedings he contributed papers. He was the secretary of the All-India Oriental Conference for a number of years and presided over its session, quite appropriately, in Mysore, in 1935. He presided over the first section of the Indian History Congress in Allahabad in 1938 and was its General President in 1940 in Lahore. It is impossible to mention all the offices he held or the honours which were conferred on him. But the most signal honour was the Campbell Gold Medal conferred on him by the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1940. He was also the recipient of a Commemoration Volume in 1936.

The writings of Aiyangar profoundly influenced other historians of India. One of the many instances of this was G. S. Sardesai, the great historian of the Marathas. Here is his own statement:[25] "When many years ago, I ploughed my lonely furrow trying to put into Marathi garb a connected story of India's past, I found myself entirely in the dark as regards any reliable data for the history of South India and the rich store of its past glory. . . . My attention came to be drawn to the writings of this learned doctor and I must say my whole view of Maratha History was profoundly influenced by them. I then realised that we could not study the Marathas by themselves and neglect the pregnant issues offered by the indigenous Hindu civilisation of Peninsular India."

Sardesai was also impressed by Aiyangar's insistence that Indian scholars should help themselves in the field of history as in other spheres of national regeneration. For Indians alone can study and accurately interpret the records and materials of India's past. Many earlier histories written by a number of eminent western scholars had became obsolete, if not entirely misleading, according to this view. Sardesai concluded by stating that Aiyangar's career had been an inspiring example to many... and deserved to be cherished as such examples of devotion to scholarship were few and far between.[26]

Some of his intimate friends have explained the reasons for his influence. Shafaat Ahmed Khan, who came into close contact with him, wrote, "Upon everything he has written are stamped thoroughness and solidity. He has also shown in his person a rare devotion to learning and a singular capacity for making and retaining friends."[27]

A colleague of his in the Central College, Bangalore, said that Aiyangar was "never in the way and never out of the way". All who knew him agreed that he was essentially reasonable and had the gift of a quiet persuasiveness which seldom failed to bring converts to the reasonable view.

REFERENCES

1. *Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume*, p. ix.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*, p. xi.
4. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.
5. *Ibid.*, p. xii.
6. *Ibid.*, p. x.
7. *Ibid.*, p. xvi.
8. *Ibid.*, p. xii.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture*, pp. x-xvi.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. xvi-xvii.
13. *Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture*, I, pp. 464 ff.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 498-500.
15. *Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume*, p. xix.
16. *Vijayanagara Sixcentenary Commemoration Volume*, p. 10.
17. *Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture*, I, ch. II.
18. *Ibid.*, ch. III.
19. *Ibid.*, ch. IV.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 360 ff.
21. *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, Lahore (IV) Session, pp. 27 ff.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Journal of Indian History*, XX, April 1941, pp. i-vii.
25. *Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume*, p. xvii.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*

RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI

DR. HARI SHANKAR SRIVASTAVA

(Gorakhpur University)

Dr. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI was born in a respectable and educated family of Bengal. His father, Gopal Chandra Mookerji M.A.,B.L. (1845-94), was a renowned High Court Vakil and Leader of the Bar at Berhampore, District Murshidabad in Bengal. He had a brilliant academic career and was recognised as an expert in legal studies. In recognition of his eminence in legal studies, he was appointed Tagore Law Professor, a very great honour in those days to an Indian, but unfortunately he died in 1894 without delivering any lecture as Professor of Law. He left behind two worthy sons—Radha Kumud Mookerji and Radha Kamal Mookerji. After completing his early education at Berhampore, Radha Kumud Mookerji came to Calcutta for higher education at the Presidency College. From the very beginning he showed signs of brilliance and sharp intelligence and won many honours. In 1901 he obtained double honours in the B.A. examination and established a record by taking his M.A. degree in History and the Cobden Medal in Economics in the same year. A year later, he obtained a second M.A. degree in English. Besides these honours, he won the famous Premchand Roychand Scholarship of the value of Rs. 7,000 together with Mowat Gold Medal. In 1915 he obtained his Ph.D. degree from the Calcutta University.

Dr. Mookerji, if he had liked, could have taken a job in Government service, but he chose to serve as a teacher, spending nearly half a century in this profession. He began his career as a Professor of English at the Ripon College and taught later, in 1903, at the Bishop's College, Calcutta. In 1906 he was appointed Hem Chandra Basu Mallick Professor at the National Council of Education, Bengal, and the Bengal National College with Sri Aurobindo Ghose as its Principal. In 1916 he was appointed as the first Maharaja Sir Manindra Chandra Nandi Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture at the Banaras Hindu University, where he stayed for hardly a year when he joined the University of Mysore as the first Professor of History. He adorned that chair for five years until he became Professor and Head of the Department of History at the Lucknow University in 1921. This was the last university he served till his retirement, being subsequently appointed Emeritus Professor of History in the same university. Dr. Mookerji passed away at Calcutta on September 9, 1963 at the age of 83.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji was highly revered and respected by

his numerous students and a large number of scholars in India and abroad. In 1942, on the occasion of the meeting of the Indian History Congress at Hyderabad, some of his friends and students formed a committee for 'a presentation volume and a lectureship foundation' in his honour. Later the committee was enlarged and consisted of eminent Indologists, artists and scholars, both Indian and foreign. In his honour the committee published *Bharata Kaumudi* containing articles by eminent scholars. The committee also provided funds to the University of Lucknow for instituting two post-graduate scholarships, known as Radha Kumud Mookerji scholarships and one Radha Kumud Gold Medal, to be awarded annually at its convocation to the best Arts graduate of the year. Subsequently, the Radha Kumud Mookerji Endowment Lectures series were instituted at this University. The first lecture in the series was delivered in 1946 by Sir S. Varadachariar, Judge of the Federal Court of India, on 'the Hindu Judicial System' and was published later by the University. In recognition of his services and scholarship, the Lucknow University conferred on Dr. Mookerji *honoris causa* the degree of Doctor of Literature at its Silver Jubilee Convocation held in 1949.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji had a unique combination of scholarship with political and social activities. He organized the Bengal Anti-Communal Award Committee of which he and Sri T. C. Goswami were elected Secretaries. Poet Rabindranath Tagore was its President; Sir B. C. Mahtab, Maharajadhiraj Bahadur of Burdwan, was elected its working President; Sarat Chandra Chatterjee, the famous novelist, and Hirendranath Dutta, the eminent philosopher, were elected its Vice-Presidents. Dr. Mookerji was elected a member of the Bengal Legislative Council as early as in 1937, as a nominee of the Indian National Congress, and was a member of that body for six years (1937-43). He was also the leader of the opposition in the Council for some time. He worked as a member of the Bengal Land Revenue Commission (known as Floud Commission) under the chairmanship of Sir Francis Floud for a year and a half (1939-40). He was a member of the Indian delegation to the F.A.O. Preparatory Commission at Washington (1946-47). In 1952 he was nominated a member of the Rajya Sabha by the President of India and served there for one full term (1952-58). He encouraged and took part in the organization of teachers as well. He presided over the Meerut session of the U. P. Secondary Education Conference and Khulna (now in Bangladesh) session of the All India Teachers' Conference.

Dr. Mookerji joined the Hindu Mahasabha and became an active member. He was the Vice-President of the All India Hindu Mahasabha for a number of years, President of the All India Hindu Youth Conference at its Lahore session, President of the Vikramaditya Celebrations at

Amritsar, organized by the Hindu Mahasabha, and President of the Akhand Bharat Conference and of its Standing Committee.

Dr. Mookerji was honoured by many academic organizations. He was Sectional Chairman at the All India Oriental Conference at its Mysore Session, President of the Early India Section of the Indian History Congress at the Lahore Session in 1940 and General President of the Indian History Congress in 1952 (Gwalior Session). He was awarded the title of *Itihas Siromani* and Sayaji Rao Gackwad prize of Rs. 7,000 by the Government of Baroda.

Scholarship and the art of speaking may not necessarily go together. Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji was both an eminent scholar and a fluent speaker. He was invited by several academic bodies to deliver lectures. On invitation he delivered lectures at the Annamalai, Bombay and Mysore Universities, Manindra lectures at the Banaras Hindu University, a series of lectures at the Punjab University, Readership lectures at the Calcutta University, Sir William Meyer lectures at the Madras University, inaugural address at the Hislop College, Nagpur, and Hitakarini Law College at Jabalpur, anniversary address at the Behar Research Society at Patna and Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute at Poona. Most of these lectures were later published.

Dr. Mookerji was closely connected with and was helped and encouraged by many eminent scholars and elder historians and men of eminence interested in the study of the Indian History and Culture. Dr. V. A. Smith saw through the press the first edition of his book on the History of Local Government in Ancient India and Dr. A. B. Keith the second edition of the same book. Dr. Mookerji had close contact with Dr. Brojendra Nath Seal, Dr. William Crooke, J. Ramsay Macdonald, Jawaharlal Nehru and several others. He was the last person to be received by Gandhiji before his assassination on January 30, 1948.

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji took up the study of Ancient Indian History and he wrote detailed and critical monographs on almost all the periods and aspects of Ancient India. He had a command of the language and wrote with ease, clarity and authority. In all his works he collected the material from all the available sources and studied them in original before drawing conclusions. His major works may be divided into five categories: (1) Biographies—like *Chandra Gupta Maurya*, *Asoka*, *Harsha*, *Men and Thought of Ancient India*; (2) General Histories—*Hindu Civilization*, *The Gupta Empire*, *Ancient India*, etc.; (3) Studies of Institutions—*Local Self-Government in Ancient India*, *The History of Indian Shipping and Maritime Activity from the Earliest Times*, *Ancient Indian Education*; (4) Books dealing with the problem of Indian unity—*Fundamental Unity of India*, *Nationalism in Hindu Culture*, *Akhand Bharat* and *A New Approach to Communal Problem*; (5) Miscellaneous Works—*Notes on Early Indian Art* and *India's Land System*.

Dr. Mookerji's *Local Self Government in Ancient India* is a pioneering work and was greatly appreciated by scholars and administrators. Writing about the book Lord Bryce wrote to the author: "One of the great needs of India seems to be reconstruction of the old fabrics of local self-government; and I have endeavoured to state this view now as a part of the new legislation proposed by Mr. Montagu." Lord Haldane observed: "You have brought out the facts establishing the existence of a highly organised system of local self-government in Ancient India, so completely the outcome of the spirit and tradition of the communities concerned that it survived through changes in sovereignty and even through revolutions." The book is based on literary and epigraphic evidences. Of the treatment of the subject and the collection of evidences, Dr. A. B. Keith wrote: "The method of treatment adopted is excellent; the collection of evidences from various periods and sources is admirably complete; the results to be derived thence are set out with equal force and lucidity."

The History of Indian Shipping and Maritime Activity from the Earliest Times is the earliest work of Dr. Mookerji. It is based on the thesis which was approved by the Calcutta University for Premchand Roychand Studentship, and was published in 1912 with an introductory note by Dr. Brojendra Nath Seal. The work traces the history of the maritime activity of the Indians in all its forms from the earliest times to the end of the Mughal Period. The introduction is divided into three sections: (i) Isolation and Intercourse, (ii) Evidences and (iii) Epochs. From the point of shipping and maritime activity of India Dr. Mookerji mentions seven epochs, viz., the Pre-Mauryan Epoch, the Mauryan Epoch (B.C. 321-184), the Kushana period in the North and the Andhra period in the South; the period of Hindu Imperialism in Northern India under the Guptas and Harsha-Vardhana; the period of Hindu Imperialism in Southern India and the rise of the Cholas; the Mussalman (Pre-Mughal) period and the period of Mughal Monarchy from the 16th to the 18th century.

"For full thirty centuries", the author asserts, "India stood out as the very heart of the Old World, and maintained her position as one of the foremost maritime countries." Several interesting facts are presented for the first time, as, for example, "the teeming ports and harbours of India, the harbour and other maritime regulations of the Mauryan Epoch, the indigenous ship-building craft, the Indian classification of vessels and their build, the paramount part played by indigenous Indian shipping in the expansion of Indian commerce and colonization from the shores of Africa and Madagascar to the farthest reaches of Malaysia and the Eastern Archipelago; the auxiliary character of the foreign intermediaries, whether Greek, Arabian or Chinese, the sources of India's manufacturing supremacy for a thousand years in her advances in applied chemistry etc." The book is based on literary sources in Pali, Sanskrit, Tamil, Bengali,

Persian and English, and archaeological and numismatic evidences available on the subject. Several informative illustrations have been made specially for this work and are very useful. This was the first publication of Dr. Mookerji, but it shows that he had the inherent historical instinct. The book was highly appreciated in India and abroad. Lord Curzon wrote: "It is a subject well worthy of treatment, which seems to have escaped the notice of previous students and I congratulate you on having made so useful a contribution to our knowledge of India." Dr. V. A. Smith wrote to the author that the book "is a possession which deserves to be treasured. The illustrations which you have brought together with so much labour are a history in themselves. Every authority on the subject has been ransacked and I cannot suggest any omission." Dr. K. P. Jaiswal, in a long article on the work in the *Hindustan Review* for 1913, wrote: "Professor Mookerji's work is one of the first attempts by Indians to present a systematic survey of the secular activities of the Hindu race. As a pioneer in his subject, he has fully succeeded in his enterprise. The volume is a production on which both the author and its country may be congratulated. The book is a mine of information and a monument of patient and scholarly work. It will remain indispensable to the students of Indian History for a long time. Any praise for the conception of the book cannot be too high."

Professor Mookerji's *Ancient Indian Education* (*Brahmanical and Buddhist*) was printed as early as 1939 but its publication was somehow delayed till 1947. This work consists of about 690 pages and 26 illustrations in line drawing. It has two parts besides a prologue of 18 pages. In part I Brahmanical education has been discussed in twelve chapters dealing with Vedic concepts and terms, Rigvedic education, education in the other Vedas, later Vedic education, education as described in the Sutra literature, education in the time of Panini, education in Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, the legal aspect of education, education as conceived in the philosophical Sutra literature, education in the epics, industrial and vocational education, and some typical educational institutions and centres. Part II consisting of another twelve chapters deals with Buddhist education. It discusses the background of Buddhist education, the system according to Vinaya, discipline, residence, instruction, industrial education, the Milinda Panha on education, education as described by Jataka, education in the fifth century A.D. (account of Fa-hien), education in the seventh century A.D. (account of Hiuen Tsang), I-tsing's account of education in the seventh century A.D., and universities (Nalanda, Valabhi, Vikramasila, Jagaddata, Odantapuri, Mithila, and Nadia). The book is one of the best works of Dr. Mookerji and shows his mastery of the subject and clarity of expression.

In Professor Mookerji's *Men and Thought in Ancient India* an attempt has been made to present a view of ancient Indian culture and civili-

unbounded wealth given away in unbounded liberality; with the dignity of a paramount sovereign joined to the humility of a beggar, master of the military as well as the fine arts, of all knowledge and virtues." (p. 189)

Professor Mookerji's *Notes on Early Indian Art,* published in 1939, consists of four sections, viz., (i) Canons of Artistic Criticism; (ii) Canons of Hindu Art; (iii) Influence of Religion on Hindu Art; and (iv) Statue and Portrait Sculpture in Indian Art, the Evolution of the Buddha Image. It has twelve illustrations. The brochure, though very brief, clearly discusses some of the very important aspects of Indian Art. The author ends the brochure with these words: "The conclusion can hardly be resisted that the Buddha image was the product of both indigenous and foreign schools of Muttra and Gandhara, and they were independent productions, without any genetic connection between them, each school producing its own type in obedience to its own technique and tradition."

Another important work of Dr. Mookerji, the *Hindu Civilization* (from earliest times up to the establishment of the Mauryan Empire), was first published in 1936. The work was intended to be a text-book for students and teachers of universities. The author says in the preface that "the work intends to bring together the results of specialised study of the different aspects of a vast subject as part of an organic whole." The book consists of seven chapters—Introduction, Pre-historic India, Geographical and Social Background, the Aryans in India: Rigvedic Civilization, Later Vedic Civilization, Indian Civilization in post-Vedic Literature and Northern India 650-325 B.C. It has eleven plates of illustrations and three maps. In the Introduction to the book the author discusses history as a subject, its scope, method and limitations, its application to Indian history and sources. Here we are able to get an idea of the author's concept of history. The chapter dealing with geographical and social background analyses geographical factors influencing history and discusses the fundamental unity of India, already discussed in an earlier work. The book is regarded as a very useful text-book for the period it covers and has been quite popular.

The monograph entitled *The Gupta Empire* was published in 1947. The book, according to the author, "seeks to bring together in a concise and condensed form all the facts and data which are derived from different sources, literary, epigraphic or numismatic." A special feature of the work is its account of the moral and material progress of the country achieved in the spacious times of the Gupta Emperors, and of the various institutions—social, economic and administrative in which the progress was embodied. There are nineteen plates, illustrating coins, building, sculpture, etc. The illustrations, specially of coins, are based on line drawings to bring out clearly the details and some of these have been prepared by such eminent artists as Nandalal Bose, Asit Kumar Haldar and P. Neogy.

Professor Mookerji's *Ancient India* (1956) is a text-book on the History of Ancient India from pre-historic times up to 10th century A.D. It has separate chapters on the Geographical and Social Background, the Deccan, South India and Greater India. There are thirty-two illustrations including three maps. The work lays stress not only on chronological but also on cultural history, on the history of thought, the varied institutions in which it is expressed and embodied, and institutions, economic, cultural, social and political, in different periods. The work has been duly documented by citing, where necessary, the original or key words and expressions, literary or epigraphic, to which conclusions are tied so as to leave no room for doubt, bias or speculation, in the manner of scientific history.

The book is actually an expansion of *Hindu Civilization* with additional chapters on the history of India up to the tenth century. It is a good text-book for the history of ancient India.

In *Fundamental Unity of India* (1914) Professor Mookerji has "not dwelt upon the important evidence of the fundamental unity of India furnished by the social and religious institutions of the country," but has confined his attention "mainly to its geographical basis." He discusses the factors that constitute nationality, opinion of European and Anglo-Indian scholars about the unity of India, and quotes from Sanskrit and Pali texts to show the fundamental unity of India. The Geography of Patanjali, Ramayana, Mahabharata, Puranas and Kalidas is examined and quoted. The unity is then illustrated by the institutions of sovereignty and historical factors. The author concludes that "both religious and political experience contributes to the growth of a geographical sense in the people and the perception of fundamental unity of India behind her continental vastness and variety."

Summing up the importance of the *Fundamental Unity of India*, Dr. F.W. Thomas, the late Boden Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford, writes: "In a country marked by so many diversities of climate, race, usage and belief, it seems to me that it was worthwhile to draw attention to the idea of the Unity which you have rightly traced in a variety of geographical and political concepts, and in the possession of a common fund of cultures."

The division of the country in 1947 gave a shock to the author of the thesis. In the Introduction to the 1954-edition of his book he has tried to re-explain his thesis thus—"A territorial separation of communities is no solution of the communal problem." He recommends the Stalin constitution of the U.S.S.R. as the best solution of the minority problem. He re-emphasizes that though the division of India into two separate states is now an accomplished fact, it should not affect all aspects of life—in both the States, specially in economic, cultural and religious spheres. "The distribution of religious places of all the communities, distribution of material resources, etc., all show that the division was unjustified." The author, however, expresses a hope "that the two new states will

respect, preserve and promote these deeper unities, in the life of their people without emphasizing their differences which are comparatively superficial and confined only to politics, for politics does not exhaust the totality of life's interests."

Professor Mookerji's *Nationalism in Hindu Culture* (1921) develops a theme dealing with the basis of nationalism in Ancient India. Some of the ideas of the book are to be found in the author's earlier work, *Fundamental Unity of India*. It discusses in different sections problems like patriotism in Sanskrit literature, Hindu conception of patriotism, the Hindu institutions of pilgrimage and its significance, pilgrimage as fostering patriotism and nationalism in ancient India, nationalism in Sanskrit literature, the nationalism of Hindu sects, nationalism as a Hindu political ideal, Sanskrit literature and its bearing on national life, the cultural equipment of Sanskrit literature and conclusions.

The author discusses and draws the conclusion that the belief that Hindu genius is almost exclusively speculative and not at all practical is not correct. The history of Indian maritime activity and a close examination of Sanskrit literature, according to the author, will show the harmonious development in both the fields of thought and action of spiritual and material progress.

The pamphlet entitled *A New Approach to Communal Problem* (1943) was written by Dr. Mookerji when the demand for Pakistan was in full swing. Dr. Mookerji who was convinced about the fundamental unity of India feared that the country might be divided on the basis of religion. He criticizes communal electorates which, he says, were responsible for the Pakistan movement. This work, according to the author, "brings together all the schemes which have solved the communal and minority problems within the framework of the parent state in the hope that it may be found useful in suggesting ways and means by which integral unity of India as a federated whole can be maintained and strengthened by a spontaneous union of all her communities in a spirit of loyalty to the common motherland which they may unite to build up as a democracy whose might and majesty will have to be reckoned with by the community of nations in world politics."

In this work the author says that minority differences are limited to race, religion and language. No state can ignore its minorities; guarantee should be given to protect their rights. He discusses the solution of the problem of minorities in other countries, specially U.S.S.R. and Canada, from whose constitutions he quotes relevant articles, and concludes that Indian communal problem could be solved by the U.S.S.R. scheme of communal and cultural autonomy. The trend of politics, he says, is towards world federation resting on the principle of non-violence (p. 62) which can be "the only basis upon which a stable world order can be built up."

In his two works, *Hindu Civilization* (chapter I) and *Ancient India*

(chapter I), Dr. Mookerji has given his concept of history and the qualities of an ideal historian. History, according to him, "deals with the past of a people or country and not with its present or future. It deals with what has been, and not with what is, or what ought to be. It records realities, actual events, or accomplished facts, and has nothing to do with ideals, with which are concerned subjects like ethics or poetry, art and literature." History deals with a country or its people, not its individual citizens as such. Does it mean that biography has no place in history? Dr. Mookerji himself has written biographies and so he asserts: "It has been said that 'the history of the world is the biography of its great men.' These men are 'great' because they represent their country or people and make its history as its leaders. The biography of such representative men is a part of history." Biography of Mahatma Gandhi, Gladstone, Winston Churchill is not the biography of an individual but the history of their people and country during the period these great men lived and worked. Dr. Mookerji wrote biographies of great men with this object in view and one of his earliest works, *Men of Thought of Ancient India*, discusses the biography of such representative men of ancient India. The past, therefore, he says, should be recorded, impartially after a careful study of all available sources —literary, epigraphic, numismatic, artistic or monumental, uninfluenced by any personal bias or preconceived convictions or tinctured by national pride. The sources and materials cannot be modified or improved by artificial means as a chemist does. History cannot be made to order. Its material is beyond the control of the historian. Thus the task before the historian is not an easy one. He "must be always true to his facts with all their imperfections in point of precision or definiteness, quality, reaction, effects, or consequences." He must "possess the objective attitude of a scientist towards the facts and phenomena of his study, the mechanical precision and perfection of the mirror in reflecting and reproducing the past, the dialectical skill of the lawyer in shifting and interrogating the evidence, the impartiality of the judge in finding the way to truth through its different or conflicting accounts, and, lastly, the insight and vision which lead to the discovery and exploration of new sources of untrodden fields."

What is the use of history? History supplies the data for social sciences like Economics and Politics. "All reforms, whether social, economic, or political, must not be a violent or complete break with the past, but should be along the lines of least resistance in consonance with the national traditions and aptitudes of the people concerned, as reflected in their history, if such reform is to take root and not to be flourished in the air."

Dr. Mookerji did not consider it right to call the Medieval period of Indian history as Muslim period. In his Introduction to *Local Self-Government in Ancient India* (pp. 11-12) he writes: "The alien kings took possession of the political capital, but they had to live in the mere suburbs of the

real metropolis of India. In this sense the so-called Muhammadan period of Indian history may be regarded as rather wrongly named, because it continued to be a period of the usual Hindu activity, the normal course of which was hardly interrupted by the political changes of the time which were nothing to Indian history." He supports his thesis by giving examples of Shankaracharya, Kalhan, Krittivas, Surdas, Tulsidas, Mirabai, the Sikh and Marathi movements to prove that Hindu activity was present throughout.

The problem of the unity of India drew the attention of Dr. Mookerji from the very beginning. He was convinced about the fundamental unity of India and continued to emphasize the point from his earliest work to the end. In his preface to the *Local Self-Government in Ancient India* he writes: "The truth is that India is fundamentally one, physically and culturally. I have very often found that the literary and epigraphic evidence, the law-books and the inscriptions, support and explain one another in spite of their differences in date and locality" (p. xii). This view is emphasized in his other works like the *Fundamental Unity of India*, *Akhand Bharat* and *A New Approach to Communal Problem*. Unfortunately, the division of the country gave a great shock to him, but he did not lose hope and reiterated his conviction in his introduction to the *Fundamental Unity of India*.

KASHI PRASAD JAYASWAL

DR. B. P. SINHA

(Patna University)

KASHI PRASAD JAYASWAL was born at Jhalda in Manbhum district in 1881, and died on November 27, 1937. During a moderately short life of 57 years, K. P. Jayaswal had carved for himself a respectable niche in the temple of Indological research.

K. P. Jayaswal belonged to a trading community. His father was a big merchant in Mirzapur in Uttar Pradesh. This enabled Kashi Prasad Jayaswal to have the best education available to well-to-do people. He studied at the London Mission School at Mirzapur and later went to Oxford for higher studies. At Oxford, he took his M.A. in History and obtained the Davis Scholarship in Chinese in 1909. He also qualified for the Bar at the Lincoln's Inn and became a Barrister-at-law. For some time he was an Honorary Scholar, Jesus College, Oxford. Young Jayaswal, while in London, could not keep himself aloof from the politics of the stirring times. The years of his stay in England were tumultuous years for Indian politics. The Morley-Minto Reforms were in the offing; a section of educated young men in India and abroad were highly dissatisfied, and were earnestly engaged in propagating extremism in thought and action. Jayaswal was actively associated with this group which had its secret cell in the India House, London, also. This did not escape the attention of the foreign rulers, and from a secret circular dated June 12, 1914, to all the District Officers by the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, we learn that "while studying for the Bar in England, Jayaswal got mixed up with the India House gang and came back to India in 1909 with the reputation of being a dangerous revolutionist."

When Jayaswal returned to India, he was desirous of entering the University of Calcutta, whose Vice-Chancellor, Sir Ashutosh Mukherjee, had a sharp eye to pick out brilliant young scholars. It was, therefore, not difficult for Jayaswal to be selected for an appointment at the Calcutta University. Had this materialised, the field of Indological research might have been more enriched by Jayaswal, who nevertheless made lasting and pioneering contributions in different fields of research in ancient Indian history. But this 'dangerous revolutionist' could not be tolerated by the alien masters. In those days the Universities were not really free enough to make appointments of their choice. When the Calcutta University appointed some young lecturers on the basis of their academic distinctions the Government of India refused to sanction the appointment of

those who were, in the Government's view, 'seditionists'. Kashi Prasad Jayaswal was one of them. This action of the Government of India created a sensation in the country in 1913, but made no impression on the imperialist ruling class.

The unjust and suspicious attitude of the government was really uncalled for. Kashi Prasad Jayaswal was not an active political agitationist or a revolutionary. He was a bright intellectual anxious to serve the Goddess of Learning, and make researches to illuminate the dark corners of the country's ancient history. He was anxious to make the best use of the academic training and equipment that he had acquired in England. K. P. Jayaswal repeatedly tried to impress on the government that whatever his political activities in England, on return to his country in 1909 he had ceased to take part in political movements and should not therefore be under suspicion.

Thwarted in his attempts to join the Calcutta University as a lecturer, Jayaswal decided to join the legal profession and he was duly admitted as an advocate in the Calcutta High Court in 1911. In May 1911, the Commissioner of Police in Calcutta expressed his opinion that K. P. Jayaswal had given up his political connections with the 'party of unrest'. However, it is on record that he continued to attend several political meetings at the Calcutta Town Hall and elsewhere and to maintain contact with a number of 'political suspects'. On being questioned by Mr. Halliday he expressed his inability to sever connections with his former close friends. Thus it is clear that in Calcutta he was a 'suspect' in the eyes of the authorities. This must have affected his profession and also his peace of mind necessary for the pursuit of academic activities.

Under these inhospitable circumstances K. P. Jayaswal transferred his practice to the Patna High Court. But even here he was allowed no peace. It appears that being constantly harassed by the government, directly or indirectly, Jayaswal who was a married man with a number of children, was even thinking of leaving his motherland and going abroad. Had this happened, one may imagine the great loss to historical research in the country. Mr. Mcpherson, the then Chief Secretary, had to observe: "Jayaswal is said to be one of the cleverest Indians of the present time, a man of exceptional talents with a special taste for historical research." Jayaswal, who did not wish to get himself involved in active agitational politics, was anxious to settle down in his profession and historical studies. He appears to have tried on many occasions to impress on the authorities his intentions, and Sir Charles Cleveland was satisfied that Jayaswal was sincere in his declarations and did not want to be forced to leave his country. So he asked the local government to give Jayaswal a chance of starting afresh and settling down quietly. The matter was considered in the Executive Council and it was decided that "the ban on him was to be suspended and he was to be given a chance of rehabilitating himself, and all suspicious

supervision or police surveillance was to be dropped. However, the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police had to keep themselves thoroughly acquainted with his doings and connections" (vide Mcpherson's confidential letter to C. E. A. W. Oldham, I.C.S., dated Ranchi, 12 June 1914).

What was possibly a loss to the active national movement became the gain of the academic and cultural world. Jayaswal threw himself heart and soul into regenerating national pride and consciousness of ancient heritage. He was largely responsible for the foundation of the Bihar and Orissa (now Bihar) Research Society in 1914, the first non-official organisation of the intellectuals of Bihar for furthering the cause of researches in Indian history and culture. The *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* was started, and the first issue came out in 1915. The official patronage to the Bihar Research Society was assured by making the Governor of Bihar its President. Jayaswal for many years remained its editor. The journal received the recognition of the Oriental scholars in and outside the country, and to date it is one of the most important research journals to be published for more than fifty years. The journal of the Bihar Research Society received numerous outstanding contributions from the pen of K. P. Jayaswal, who remained a member of the governing council of the Bihar Research Society till his death.

Jayaswal was also the driving spirit behind the establishment of the Patna Museum. It was an irony that Bihar, which had the nation's most celebrated monuments and had precious relics of the past literally littered over its surface and underneath, had no museum. With the active patronage of Edward Gait and P. C. Manuk, Bar-at-law, the Patna Museum was started with a few antiquities in a room in the Government House, and was later shifted to the High Court. As a result of the persistent efforts and active supervision of K. P. Jayaswal, the Museum got its local habitation in its newly erected building. The architectural style of the building—unique in Patna and a synthesis of Hindu and Muslim art—was to a great extent suggested by Jayaswal himself and executed by Mr. Sohan Lal, the engineer-in-charge of the construction. The Patna Museum is now not only the principal state museum but has the richest collections in ancient terracottas and bronzes. Its collections of coins, specially of Punch mark, are also impressive. It is on record that Jayaswal was the guiding spirit and remained associated with the Museum as a member of the Managing Committee and later as its President. In 1924 he became a member of the Bodh Gaya Temple Enquiry Committee set up at the instance of the Indian National Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha. Dr. Rajendra Prasad was also a member of the committee.

K. P. Jayaswal thus kept himself pretty busy in academic and cultural activities, and high government officials including the Governor

appear to have lent their support to his efforts in organising cultural activities.

But K. P. Jayaswal's chief claim to eminence lies in his momentous and varied contributions to research in Indology. He first came into prominence with his articles on "An Introduction to Hindu Polity" in the *Modern Review* in 1913. Later these articles were published in book form in 1924 under the title *Hindu Polity*. From 1911 to 1913 he had written a few articles on ancient Hindu law in the *Calcutta Weekly Notes*. These articles and the methodology adopted by him were noted with appreciation by one of the foremost jurists, Dr. Joseph Kohler, Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Berlin, who claimed in *Zeitschrift fur Vogel Rechpwissenchaft* that these articles published in the *Calcutta Weekly Notes* "marked a new stage in the history of the study of Indian Law". His articles on Hindu Law naturally attracted the attention of the Calcutta University, which decided to invite Jayaswal to deliver lectures on some aspects of ancient Hindu Law, a subject on which Jayaswal was appearing as a competent expert and original thinker. In 1917 K. P. Jayaswal was invited by the Calcutta University to deliver twelve lectures on *Manu and Yajnavalkya* for the Tagore Law lectures. These lectures were delivered in 1919. But Constitution and Law (*Hindu Polity*, and *Manu and Yajnavalkya*) were not to remain his sole fields of study. He was making researches into all branches of the comprehensive subject—Indian history and culture. His interest in the problem of the reconstruction of political history and chronology of ancient India was shown as early as 1915 when the first part of the first volume of the *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* carried his article entitled "Saisunaka and Mauryan Chronology and the Date of the Buddha's Nirvana". In the second volume, part I, published in 1916, he contributed an article on the Empire of Bindusara, and the third volume had from his pen "Chronological Summary in Puranic Chronicles and the Kali-yuga era". In the fourth volume can be studied with profit his article on "The Brihadratha Chronology, *cir.* 1727 B.C.-727 B.C." He made original suggestions about the Sunga history in his article "Revised Date on the Brahmin Empire" in volume IV, part III. His article on the statue of Wema Kadphises and Kushana Chronology (vol. VI, part I) sought to support the theory of Thomas and others about Kanishka being the founder of the Saka era. His articles entitled "Contributions to the History of Mithila" appeared in volume IX, parts III and IV, and volume X, parts I and II, and in these he made very significant contributions to the hitherto comparatively dark chapter in the history of Bihar. His use of the *Gargi Samhita* of the *Yuga Purana* in reconstructing the history of the Bactrian Greek invasions of India including Magadha and the contributions of the Sunga rulers in resisting the foreign invaders was ingenious and largely profitable. Relying mainly on this new material, he tried to reconstruct the history under Pushyamitra Sunga in his article "On the Rule of

Pushyamitra Sunga", vol. XV, parts III-IV. He then turned his attention to the problems of the Saka-Satavahana history, and laid great stress on the traditions contained in *Kalakacharyakathanaka*. His article on the Problem of Saka-Satavahana History appeared in volume XVI (parts III and IV), and volume XVIII (part I). But his most widely read and discussed book on political history is the *History of India c. 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.* He christened the period as Naga-Vakataka Imperial period. This appeared in volume IX of the *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* and was published in book form in 1933. The period 150-350 A.D., from the fall of the Kushana to the rise of the Imperial Guptas, was dubbed as the Dark Age in Indian history. Jayaswal, by piecing together bits of informations scattered here and there in the Puranic literature in inscriptions and coins, tried to disprove this theory of the Dark Age and to reconstruct the political history of the period to show that it was an era of great national resistance and a bright epoch in the political and cultural history of India. Viewed through his eyes, the Gupta empire and its cultural excellence emerge as natural successors of the Naga-Vakataka Age. His last important contribution to political history was a long article on the Chronology and History of Nepal, 600 B.C.-880 A.D., which appeared in volume XXII, part II. Another article entitled "Chandra Gupta II Vikramaditya and his Predecessor", appeared in volume XVIII, part I, and threw fresh light on the problem.

K. P. Jayaswal also made valuable contributions to Indian epigraphic studies. His pioneering efforts in deciphering the Hathigumpha inscriptions of Kharavela are well known to students of ancient Indian history and epigraphy. His reading of a Maurya era and his identification of 'dimita' with Demetrius were challenged, but no one could deny the hard labour and meticulous care that he devoted to reading this very difficult inscription put up high on a cave-wall which could be approached with great difficulty. His reading of the inscription was published in volume III of the Journal, and further notes on the Hathigumpha inscriptions appeared in volume III, part VI; and volume IV, parts I and IV, entitled "Hathigumpha Inscription Revised from Book with Plates". He published with correction an article "Hathigumpha Inscription of the Emperor Kharavela" in volume XIII, parts III and IV of the Journal. He again wrote "Hathigumpha Notes" in volume XIV, part I. He also contributed articles on Asokan Inscription, such as "Asoka's Inscription, II" in volume IV, part II, "The Exact Date in the Reign of Asoka" in volume XVII, part IV. His attempts to read the names of the kings of Magadha like Ajatsatru and others of Saisunaka dynasty on the Yaksha images (vols. V-VI) drew the attention of great scholars like Barnett and Smith. His articles on the origin of Brahmi (vol. VI, part II) deserve notice. He edited important copperplate inscriptions in Bhuvaneshwar Temple (vol. V, part II)

and a very important inscription of the Sunga dynasty in volume X, part III, and made further studies on the Sunga inscription of Ayodhya in volume XIII, parts III-IV. He also edited an important Brahmi inscription (Barli stone) in volume XVI, part I, and made a critical study of a passage in the Samudra Gupta inscription at Allahabad in volume XVII, part II. He brought to the public eye some unpublished seals (vol. XX, part I) and made studies in seals of the 2nd century A.D. (vol. XXIII, part I). His suggestions on the Rajgir (Maniyar Math) stone image inscription were published in volume XXII, part II. He was one of the first to point out the political and chronological importance of the Janibigha inscriptions of the year 83 of the Lakshmanasena Era (vol. IV, part III). He critically discussed the problem of dating in the Lakshmanasena Era in his article published in volume XX, part I of the Journal. He edited the Kandaha inscription of King Narasimhadeva of Mithila dated s. 1357 in the same volume.

His contributions to the numismatic studies are also not negligible. His article on Purana coin and the date of Manava Dharmasastra, XVII (pl. IV), is interesting as it suggests that the term 'purana' for the coin meant that a new currency system was introduced later. In his *History of India, c. 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.*, Jayaswal has suggested numerous new readings for the legends on the coins of the Gangetic Valley, some of which have been shown to be wrong. He wrote on six unique silver coins of the Sunga (XX, Pl. I) and on some Hindu coins of pre-Christian centuries (XXII, II). He published "New Coins of the Naga-Vakataka period" in volume XXII, part II, and his last article entitled "Numismatic Notes on some Hindu Coins of pre-Christian Centuries" appeared in volume XXIII, part I. Jayaswal created a mild sensation among numismatists when he attributed some punch-marked coins to the Mauryan period. In 1934 he placed his conclusions regarding Mauryan coins before the Royal Asiatic Society, London. His views were naturally not endorsed by the learned assembly, but the President prophetically warned the members that like the theories of Sir Alexander Cunningham, those of Jayaswal were criticised by his contemporaries, but might find acceptance afterwards. Recently Dr. P. L. Gupta, a noted Indian numismatist, has assigned a particular series of punch-marked coins to the Nandas and the Mauryas.

Jayaswal also edited with learned commentary many hitherto unpublished texts. Amongst these his editing of the *Rajanti Ratnakara* by Candeswara with commentaries introduced to the learned world an important book on polity written in the early medieval period of Indian history. Another significant contribution was the publication of *Bhattasvamin's Commentary on Kautilya's Arthasastra*, which appeared as appendix to vols. XI and XII of the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*. He edited with a commentary the *Gargi Samhita*, and introduced the Paris manuscript of the same. He edited a number of volumes of Sanskrit manuscripts of Mithila.

He also edited the *Adhyardhasataka* by Matriceta and *Vigrahavyavarttani* by Acharya Nagarjuna for the profit of select specialist scholars. But his most important work in this field was editing with comments in collaboration with Rahula Sankirtayana the Tibetan version of the *Manju Sri Mulakalpa*, including for comparison the Sanskrit text. This was published as *An Imperial History of India* in 1934. This book, enriched with Jayaswal's comments, contains new information about political and cultural history of the country, particularly with regard to the Gupta and later Gupta history. His study and translation of the Lassen's *History of Indian Commerce* proved a very profitable source-material for students of India's economic history. But Jayaswal will always be remembered for his pioneering work entitled *Hindu Polity*. His interests in the literature of ancient Indian political science continued, and his article on "New Light on Hindu Political Science Literature" was a refreshing study of the subject, published in volume XI, part I. He rather imaginatively argued (vol. XVIII, part I) that Sikhara, the minister of Chandra Gupta II, wrote a book on political science. His article on "A Hindu Text on Painting" (vol. IX, part I), and a note on certain Sanskrit Geographical and Ethnic terms (vol. XVIII, part I), give us an idea of the wide field of ancient Indian history that he traversed with zeal and admirable scholarship.

It is not an easy task to evaluate the work of K. P. Jayaswal as a whole. The methodology that he appears to have followed was one usually taken up by an advocate. He appears to start with some leading questions and, after giving his own answers, he would marshal all possible strong or weak arguments in support of his stand, like any clever advocate. This becomes clear in his work, *History of India, c. 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.* He starts with quotations from V. A. Smith with the intention of showing their incorrectness and proceeds to introduce evidences and marshal arguments to prove the utter inadequacy of Smith's statements. In this he has often, with the best of intentions, misled himself and his readers by his questionable readings of most indistinct legends on some coins. He uses the 'historical method'. In all his works, he introduces a long historical introduction before coming to grip with his subject-matter, and step by step leads his readers to the main theme after, often successfully, so conditioning their minds as to be persuaded to accept his reasoning and conclusions. In his *Manu and Yajnavalkya*, the first lecture is on "Hindu Law before the Code of Manu". He followed the 'comparative method', and on the basis of his comparative study of the contents of Manu and Yajnavalkya Smritis, concluded that the Yajnavalkya Smriti was later than Manu Smriti.

Jayaswal did not discuss what his ideas of history were, but on a study of his writings one may find that he belonged to the line of nationalist historians. An ardent nationalist with a history of political activity and association, Jayaswal was proud of the national heritage, and the versatile

genius of the Indian people in bygone ages. He hated the contemporary foreign rule and was consistently condemning the foreign rulers of ancient days. The nationalist in him would never allow him to give the devil his due; he could never accept that a foreign ruler could ever be the least beneficial in any sense or aspect. The total anti-Indianness of all foreign rule was what he believed in and what he tried to show to his readers. Impartial Indian scholars have given some credit to and shown their appreciation of the Kushana contributions to the development of Indian religions and culture, art and literature, not only in this country but outside. To Jayaswal the Kushana policy was "a policy of social tyranny and religious fanaticism, both actuated by political motives". He goes further, and after indulging in spacious arguments, concludes that "Kushana rule destroyed them [the pre-Gupta Hindu temples]". His strong nationalist bias leads him to strongly defend the Varnashrama system and the ritual-ridden religion, which he regards as essential elements of ancient Hindu nationalism. He observes: "The Saka rule aimed at denationalising the Hindus and at the basic destruction of their national system. The social revolutions which the Sakas strove for with a calculated policy, was a scheme to depress the high and aristocrat, the custodians of national culture and the trustees of national liberty—the Brahmin and the Kshatriya." Impartial critics of the Kushana rule will not find enough evidence to credit or discredit the Kushanas with the alleged successful scheme to destroy the Varnashrama Dharma and Hindu religion. Kadphises II and Vasudeva could not be accused of anti-Hinduism. But Jayaswal's main concern was to show the totally unacceptable character of all foreign rule and its calculated policy to denationalise the enslaved nation. Probably he was transferring the attributes of the British rule in his days, as he saw them, to the Kushanas. And, as any movement against the British rule, and for reassertion of Hindu ideas and cultural norms would be a nationalist movement, he saw in the rise of the Bharasiva-Nagas and the growth of the Vakataka power the fulfilment of national aspirations of the period (150-350 A.D.) against the degraded and tyrannical rule of the alien Saka-Kushanas. He, therefore, wove a story from scattered slender threads, often of doubtful authenticity, of a national regeneration movement against the foreign rule, and tried to demonstrate the resounding success of the movement. According to him "the undertaking to deliver the country from such a national calamity was shouldered by Bharasivas on the Ganges.... They undertook to execute and they successfully executed that national dance of destruction in the valley of the Ganges." In order to enhance the so-called achievements of the Bharasivas, the enemy's—the Kushana's —power is at first magnified, and then the success of the Bharasivas from humble beginnings against such a great power is admirably dramatised. "That power now to be challenged by a leader risen from obscurity was a bigger fact than the challenge by the subject Greeks against the mam-

moth Persian empire.... It was not the question of merely throwing off a suzerainty, it was not the case of merely tearing off the veil of prestige hanging from a distance, but attacking directly a mighty power bodily installed in the country. The Bharasivas did it and did it successfully." Should we not here read the mighty British Empire and the Indian nationalist movement under Gandhiji for the Kushana Empire and the humble Bharasivas? Could not his conclusions inspire with confidence the nationalist leaders about their ultimate success just to prove that history repeats itself? "The greedy imperialism of the Kushanas was destroyed: the Hindu people were purged of deteriorated morals. And when the task was done the Bharasivas retired.... They restored the Hindu imperial throne and the national civilisation and gave a new life to their country.... they left their deeds and obliterated themselves." Voluntarily, one may suspect. But the Allahabad pillar inscription shows that the Nagas had to be violently exterminated by Samudra Gupta. But Jayaswal would not take this into account. This would distort his theme.

In Jayaswal's days of intense nationalist zeal and movements sweeping across the country, it was natural for intellectuals to impress on the educated and non-educated people that there was nothing to be dazzled by in the comprehensive character of the British Indian Empire, nor in the British claims to be the best democracy run by parliamentary and representative institutions. When important historians like Smith were writing about India always being parcelled into a congeries of states, quarrelling with one another, and ruled always by a despot, whether oppressive as Chandra Gupta Maurya or benevolent as Asoka, Jayaswal was painstakingly working on his thesis that India had the earliest and most successful republics, and also had the 'limited monarchy' of which the west was so proud. In his book *Hindu Polity* Jayaswal tried to prove that republics were as old as the post-Vedic age, and were more powerful and larger than the Greek republics. He argued with great force that Indian monarchy from the Vedic times onwards was not absolute but limited and responsible. As early as 1911 and 1912, Jayaswal had started his special study to find out what constitutional progress, if any, ancient Indians had achieved. A connected paper was read at the Hindi Literary Conference in 1912 and its translation published in the *Modern Review* in 1913, under the title "An Introduction to Hindu Polity" and Jayaswal claimed that before the publication of the Introduction there had been no work in any modern language on the subject.

Hindu Polity has been divided into two parts; the first part deals with Republics, and the second deals with Monarchy. The story is taken down to the middle of the 4th century A.D. to the Gupta imperial system. Jayaswal followed in this work the historical method fully. He began with a brief discussion on sources and then started with the Vedic assemblies, the *Sabha* and the *Samiti*, the latter he described as the sovereign assembly of Vedic

times. He thought that in the beginning it was an assembly of the whole people, but in his own words, "we already find in the Vedic period the principle of representation appreciated and variously acted upon" (*Hindu Polity*, p. 14). As, according to him, the *Samiti* discussed and decided upon all matters concerning the state, he viewed in modern context the Sabha "as the standing and stationary body of selected men working under the authority of the Samiti", and to him "the Sabha was the National judicature" and passed judgement on criminals. With chapter IV of part I begins the actual discussion on Hindu Republics which rose in the post-Vedic period (*Hindu Polity*, p. 25). There is no doubt that Rhys Davids was the first scholar to point out the existence of republics in Buddha's time. But it was left to Jayaswal to thoroughly examine the problem and trace the references about republics in the ancient Hindu literature. He pointed out that *Gana* in the literature meant republic and *Sangha* has the same derivative meaning. *Ganas* or *Sanghas* meant a republican community in which decisions were made not by one man but by a collective body by counting of heads. Jayaswal showed from references to republics in the *Ashtadhyayi*, in the early Buddhist literature, in the Greek accounts, in the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya, in the *Mahabharata*, in the Maurya and the Sunga periods, in the Saka-Kushana interlude and in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra Gupta that the republican tradition was actively present in Indian body polity from 600 B.C. to 450 A.D. "With the end of the 5th century Republics disappear from Hindu India." To show the great constitutional progress or rather experiments made by ancient Hindus, Jayaswal looked upon Bhaujya, Swarajya, Vairajya, Dvairajya, and Arajaka as different forms of state flourishing in ancient India (*Hindu Polity*, pp. 89-101). Relying upon the democratic procedure in the Buddhist Sangha, Jayaswal believed that the ancient Hindu republics introduced resolutions, debated on them and finally decided by vote of the majority. There was provision of a quorum and there were officials in charge of different duties to see that the assembly was properly called and constituted, and that it followed the correct procedure. He even establishes the practice of *Referendum* involving the whole city, and not merely of voting in the assembly (*Hindu Polity*, p. 115). Jayaswal made a critical analysis of the elements of strength and weakness of the republics. According to him, a high sense of justice, adherence to discipline, belief in the equality of all citizens, economic prosperity and existence of people's militia accounted for their success and longevity. But the smallness of the units and their liability to fall victims to intrigues contributed to their fall.

In Book II, chapter XXII, begins a detailed discussion on Hindu Monarchy. To Jayaswal the Rigvedic king was elected, and "regular tax as royal due had already developed" (*Hindu Polity*, Book II, p. 9). The king, according to Jayaswal's interpretation of the ceremony of the passing of the *Mani* to the king, "thus accepted his royal authority from the whole

folk including the king-makers and the artisans." The theory of limited monarchy could not be better expressed than in these words of Jayaswal—"The fact, if not the theory, was clear that the office of the king was a creation of the people and was held conditionally. Above him there was always the National Assembly, the Samiti, which was, as we have seen above, the real sovereign" (*ibid.*, p. 13). Jayaswal was the first scholar who drew attention to the constitutional significance of the coronation ceremony of the Brahmana period. Jayaswal strongly argues that the king-elect, before he is seated on the throne, has to take the coronation-oath, which is given in the Aitareya Brahmana, "Between the night I was born and the night I die, whatever good I might have done, my heaven, my life and my progeny may I be deprived of, if I deprive you." Jayaswal observes, "The business-like and contractual nature of the oath is noteworthy. There is no reference to any divine agency in the oath. It is purely human. It is humanly solemn" (*ibid.*, p. 28). He interprets the ceremony of touching the king's person with a rod as showing that Law was above the King (*ibid.*, p. 35). In Jayaswal's view the theory of the Divine origin of kingship first clearly indicated in the Manusmriti was never approved or adopted by a single subsequent law-book (*ibid.*, p. 57). He observed that "The Hindu theory of kingship was not permitted to degenerate into a divine imposture and profane autocracy" (*ibid.*, p. 59). His theory that the Hindu kingship was contractual in nature and could not be constitutionally autocratic, naturally led him to search for institutional checks on royal authority. This led him to propound the theory of sovereign popular assemblies—*Paura* and *Janapada*—in ancient Hindu kingdoms. He found references to these not only in the Epics and the Dharmashastras but also in the inscriptions of Kharavela and of Asoka. To him Paura and Janapada did not mean simply the people of the city and the country-side, but collective political institutions of the city and the nation as a whole. "The capital Assembly (Paura) is a twin sister of the Janapada in Constitutional matters" (*ibid.*, p. 68). "The Paura had a double character, as a local self-administration of the capital and a constitutional assembly" (*ibid.*, p. 79). According to him the Paura-Janapada deliberated on the nomination of Yuvaraja and on the deposition of the king, took part in coronation ceremonies, and discussed and decided upon the matters of state policy placed before it "by the cabinet of ministers with the king" (*ibid.*, p. 85). The tenure of ministers depended, to a considerable extent, on the goodwill and confidence of the Paura-Janapada, and grant of extra-ordinary taxes to the king was in their hands. Jayaswal interprets a passage in the *Mahabharata* as an address from the throne asking for extra taxes from the Paura-Janapada (*ibid.*, p. 89). Asoka is said to have discussed his new Dharma with the Janapada assembly (*ibid.*, p. 96). Jayaswal concludes that "they (Janapada) were thus a machinery not only for the restricted purposes of taxation and economic advancement but for all vital

interests of the country" (*ibid.*, p. 96). He felt justified in calling this institution with these constitutional attributes as the Hindu Diet; the Paura -Janapada was a powerful check on royal authority (*ibid.*, p. 108). The Council of Ministers was another constitutional institution, which, according to Jayaswal, was a great check on royal absolutism. According to him, "It is a law and principle of Hindu Constitution that the king cannot act without the approval and cooperation of the council of ministers" (*ibid.*, p. 116). There was Prime Minister as the leader of the cabinet. Relying on a late Buddhist tradition, Jayaswal came to a categorical conclusion that Chancellor Radha-Gupta refused to make further gifts to the Buddhist Brotherhood on the order of Emperor Asoka (*ibid.*, p. 120), and Rudradaman was similarly opposed by his ministers with regard to his proposal to repair the Sudarsana lake (*ibid.*, pp. 120-21). Jayaswal further suggested that in the Council of Ministers there were seats assigned to the leaders of the Paura and Janapada (*ibid.*, p. 130). He takes *Prakritis* to mean the people or the subjects, meaning thereby their representatives—the chiefs of the Paura and Janapada (*ibid.*, p. 131). "As the minister was Raja-Rashtra-bhrit, so the king was consequently bound. . . to follow the dictates of the council" (*ibid.*, p. 137), and "he was always under the control of the ministers." "The king had no option to veto a measure decided by the majority of the council" (*ibid.*, p. 139). Under such a constitution, if a king had despotic tendencies the result would be revolution (*ibid.*, p. 143), and Asoka had to concede independence from his control to the Rajukas who opposed him and won their point for the benefit of the Janapada, which evidently supported the ministers (*ibid.*, p. 146). Thus "the king was constitutionally a servant of the people." Jayaswal sums up the position thus: "With this defined position, shackled with the checks and limitations we have noticed, subjugated under the great constitutional power of the Paura-Janapada, with a conscience trained to be prone to listen to the public voice, his position really was that of the servant of the State" (*ibid.*, p. 185). It is clear that Jayaswal laboured hard to prove that the Hindu monarchy was even more limited, responsible and constitution-bound than the British monarchical system which was being proclaimed as an ideal political system. We had our Diet no less powerful than the English Parliament.

If the British boasted of having their large empire and having brought the whole Indian sub-continent under one empire, there was the great Naga-Vakataka empire, succeeded by the greater Gupta empire which had its sway not only over very large parts of India but over the islands of the sea as well. Jayaswal's writings tend to show that we had, all and in good measure, what the British masters claim to have or to bestow. We had our large empires, successful and long-lived republics, our representative assemblies, powerful parliaments, strong cabinets of ministers, supremacy of Law above the executive authority, and a constitutionally limited monarchy.

It is to be admitted that Jayaswal's writings, in the context of the time, could be profitable. The national consciousness and pride about progress in the constitutional field in the past, seldom emphasised by scholars before, certainly served a useful purpose. Moreover, the attention of the scholars was drawn to this very exciting field of study on the basis of varied Indian sources. In this respect Jayaswal's *Hindu Polity* was a pioneering work. All later scholars, Indian and foreign, had to discuss and examine his theories. It is true that some of his important conclusions, like the existence and character of the Paura and Janapada assemblies, have been shown to be not correct (see Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India*). His view of the coronation-oath to the people has been questioned by Dr. Ghoshal. Whether the Council of Ministers was as important and powerful in the time of Asoka, as Jayaswal would have us believe, is very doubtful. His entire laboriously built-up theory of the Bharasiva-Vakataka all-India empire, resting on questionable readings of legends and attribution of coins and on very infrequent and scattered references in the Puranic literature, has been very plausibly shown by Altekar to be almost a castle in the air. Jayaswal's main weakness appears to be his over-enthusiasm to build up his pet theories about the glorious heritage of the ancient Hindus in political and constitutional fields, and to see the full maturity of modern constitutional ideas and political systems in ancient India. For this he often appears to run away with the slenderest evidence and build up his vast edifice on foundations not carefully checked. Without going into the limitations of the later Buddhist traditions and Asokan legends he concluded about a vigorous Diet and powerful cabinets at work in the imperial system of the Mauryas. His theory of the empire of Samudra Gupta being just a take-over of the Naga-Vakataka empire overlooked the contents of the Allahabad Pillar inscription, which clearly shows that Samudra Gupta did not face any empire but actually a congeries of states in the Gangetic-Jamuna Valley.

But are the writings of Jayaswal to be dismissed as of no value, no substantial permanent contributions? This would be going to the other extreme. The systematic history of ancient Indian republics that he put before the learned world was not only the first in the field but has to date formed the main framework of later researches. The writings of Ghoshal and Altekar show their indebtedness to Jayaswal. His discussions on the constitutional significance of the coronation ceremonies are richly rewarding, and Dr. U. N. Ghoshal has again critically discussed the problem and has suggested modifications in the interpretations of Jayaswal, which is quite normal in the world of scholarship. But his drawing attention to this aspect was certainly highly imaginative and at the same time suggestive of further research. Jayaswal's writings certainly gave a rude shock to those scholars and administrators who had assumed the existence of an Oriental Despotism in India before the advent of the British rule and

British constitutional institutions in the country. He stimulated researches into the political and constitutional fields of ancient Indian history; hitherto studies in ancient Indian religion, philosophy and art were receiving major attention. Jayaswal's contributions to political history also are not negligible. While his main thesis of the existence of the Naga -Vakataka empire in North India may be rejected, there is no denying the fact that he pieced together stray references in epigraphs, literature and coins and showed for the first time the great part that the Bharasiva and other Nagas played in Indian history before the rise of the Guptas. He certainly succeeded in showing that the period between the extinction of the Kushana and Andhra dynasties and the rise of the imperial Gupta dynasty was not "one of the darkest in the whole range of Indian history", as Smith would have us believe. Jayaswal was the first Indian scholar who introduced *Manju Sri Mulakalpa* as a book throwing important light on the political history of India. His reconstructions of the histories of Nepal and Mithila, though very much modified in the light of new materials and fresh interpretations, remain the basic source books for the history of these regions. Jayaswal's plunges into epigraphy and numismatics were not equally rewarding, but he was honest enough to revise his reading of the Hathigumpha inscription of Kharavela more than once.

In the short span of twenty-five years of his scholarly activities K. P. Jayaswal has left us a large volume of original research material. Some may often wonder whether if he had waited a little more to evaluate his sources more critically, he could have bequeathed such varied and pioneering contributions. His was the *original spade* which removed the first earth from the then almost virgin soil, and in this he was naturally a more enthusiastic pioneer than a careful meticulous researcher who waits long to examine his sources by all canons of scholarly criticism. K. P. Jayaswal appears to be in a hurry to place his ideas, some of them very original and exciting, before the learned people. As a clever advocate he was anxious to stress upon the arguments for his brief, and was not acting as a judge who hears both sides and comes to his conclusions.

HEM CHANDRA RAYCHAUDHURI

DR. B. K. MAJUMDAR

(Jadavpur University)

THE introduction of Western education, the study of European literature, history, philosophy and science, is a landmark in the history of our country. Its direct impact was the Indian Awakening in the 19th century and the so-called Bengal Renaissance which transformed the land from the social, religious and political points of view and marked the transition from the medieval to the modern age. In the history of the Indian Awakening of the 19th century, Bengal actually played the same part as Italy did in the story of the European Renaissance. The foundation in 1817 of the Hindu College (later Presidency College) which is rightly looked upon as the greatest seminary of Western education in India gave immense impulse to the revival of arts, letters and learning. One important aspect of the Renaissance in Bengal was to discover and revive India's past. This was rendered possible by the foundation of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta as early as 1784 by the well-known Orientalist scholar Sir William Jones. The publication of research journals like the *Asiatick Researches* (1788), *Quarterly Journal* (1821), *Gleanings in Science* (1829) and the *Journal of the Asiatic Society* (1832) ushered in a period of historical research and gradual development of Indological studies in India. It is interesting to note here that Indians recovered in the 19th century their long-lost ancient literature, both Brahmanical and Buddhist, together with the buried architectural monuments of the palmy days of the Hindus through the efforts and enterprise of European scholarship. The ancient sacred scriptures of the Indo-Aryans had long disappeared from the Indian soil and nobody could interpret them properly. These were printed by the English and made available to Indians. Similarly, the lost Buddhist works collected by scholars from the different parts of the Buddhist world and printed in Europe reached India, the land of their origin. This gave a fillip to Indological studies.[1]

The study of Indian antiquities was initiated in Bengal by a band of Western scholars like William Jones, H. T. Colebroke, Charles Wilkins, H. H. Wilson, James Prinsep, Alexander Cunningham, Max Müller and others with a view to unravel the heritage of India's past and the excellent civilisation that was her own. Next to Western scholars, a group of Bengali scholars and writers, who had drunk deep in English education, came forward and engaged themselves in the task of studying Indology and writing the history of their motherland. Kedarnath Datta, the author

of *Bharatvarsher Itihas*, showed the way in 1860. Historiography or the History of History was born among Indians in the middle of the nineteenth century. A notable contribution in this field was made by Rajendralal Mitra (1822-92), a Bengali writer who became the first Bengali research scholar of repute. His long association with the Asiatic Society of Bengal, both as Secretary and President, his vast erudition, his mastery over languages and his analytical mind enabled him to produce two works of outstanding merit—*The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal* (1882) and *The Antiquities of Orissa* in two volumes published in 1875 and 1880. These two works at once marked him out as a scholar, a researcher, an antiquarian and a historian.

Rajendralal's worthy successor in the field of Indological studies and research was Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasad Sastri (b. 1853), a precious product of the Bengal Renaissance. H. P. Sastri was an eminent historian. Besides his manifold activities in the domain of literature and language, he shone also as a writer of history. He edited a text of *Ballalcharita* by Annada Bhatta in 1904, published Sandhyakaranandi's *Ramacharita* in 1910 and edited Asvaghosh's *Saundrananda Kavya* in the same year. He wrote a number of scholarly articles in the pages of the *Epigraphia Indica*, the Memoirs and Journals of the Asiatic Society and other journals. He was the author of a History of India. It was published in 1895 and revised by him in 1912. Rajendralal Mitra and Haraprasad Sastri did much pioneering work and the ground was thus prepared for the advent of a band of eminent Bengali historians like Akshoy Kumar Moitra, essentially an epigraphist and a writer on Indian arts and crafts, who ended by becoming the author of *Serajudowla* and *Feringi Banik*; Rakhaldas Banerjee, an emiment archaeologist and the author of *History of Orissa* and *Banglar Itihas*. Ramesh Chandra Majumdar, the author of countless research publications beginning with *Corporate Life in Ancient India*, R. P. Chanda, the author of *Indo-Aryan Races* and other articles, R. K. Mukherji, the author of *Local Government in Ancient India*, *Asoka*, *Hindu Civilisation*, etc., whose contributions to ancient Indian history and culture are valuable and noteworthy. To this brilliant galaxy of Bengali historians belongs Hem Chandra RayChaudhuri who began his career as a lecturer in History in Bangabasi College, Calcutta, and worthily ended as Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture, University of Calcutta, in succession to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar.

Hem Chandra RayChaudhuri was born in 1892 in an educated Vaidya family in the village of Ponabalia in Barisal district, now in Bangladesh. From his early boyhood he was a brilliant student. He passed the Entrance examination of the Calcutta University in 1907, standing first among the candidates from the then Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam. He graduated with First Class Honours in History in 1911. He was the Eshan

Scholar of the year, having obtained the highest marks in Honours subjects. He stood First Class First in the M.A. Examination in History in 1913. He began his vocation in life as a lecturer in History in Bangabasi College and worked in the same capacity in Presidency College for some time. He then joined Calcutta University as a lecturer when the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture was created by Sir Asutosh Mukherjee. An unassuming type of man with a rare gift of memory and geniality of temper, he in no time earned reputation as an eminent scholar and a successful teacher. For his substantial researches in ancient Indian history he was admitted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy some time in 1921. He served Calcutta University for 34 years from 1918 to 1952. From 1936 to 1952 he was the Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture. He was elected Sectional President (Section 1 up to 711 A.D.) in the Hyderabad session of the Indian History Congress. In 1950 he had the honour of being elected the General President for the 13th session of the Indian History Congress at Nagpur.

Professor RayChaudhuri wrote on various branches of ancient Indian history, political history, religious history and historical geography, etc. He contributed a large number of articles to different journals. His major publications are: (i) *The Political History of Ancient India from the Accession of Parikshit to the Extinction of the Gupta Empire;* (ii) *Materials for the Study of Early History of the Vaishnava Sect;* (iii) *Studies in Indian Antiquities.*

I. *The Political History of Ancient India* was first published by the Calcutta University in 1923. It has run into as many as six editions in the course of thirty-five years. It is a standard work on the subject and considering its subject-matter, originality, manner of presentation and wealth of details, it stands unrivalled even now. It consists of two parts. Part I of the work deals with the period from the accession of Parikshit (*c.* 9th century B.C.) following the Bharata war to the accession of Bimbisara, the king of Magadha, in the 6th century B.C. The chief interest of part I lies in the fact that the author built up a sober history of the period by a judicious use of a conflicting mass of traditions preserved in Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain literatures. In the preface to the first edition Dr. RayChaudhuri stated how the idea of the work suggested itself. He observed "a tendency in current books to dismiss the history of the period from the Bharata war to the rise of Buddhism as incapable of arrangement in definite chronological order." He took up the challenge and successfully gave us an authentic chronological history of ancient India in the post-Parikshit pre-Bimbisara period. Of the kingdoms and peoples mentioned in the later Vedic texts, the Kurus "whose kingdom flowed with milk and honey" enjoyed a sort of primacy among others under Parikshit's son, King Janamejaya, who performed the Asvamedha sacrifice and annexed Takshasila. Next in order of succession, the kingdom of Videha with its

capital at Mithila came to the forefront under the 'Philosopher king' Janaka who bore the title of Samrat. Supremacy then passed to and was retained by Kosala which for a time contested with the Kasis for control over Madhyadesa until the rise of Magadha to overmastering power under Bimbisara. This is how Dr. RayChaudhuri tried by his profound scholarship and penetrating insight to establish a rational link in the chain of political events in Northern India from the later Vedic times to the advent of the Sisunagas under Srenika Bimbisara in the middle of the sixth century B.C. A notable feature of this portion is the author's knowledge of the historical geography of ancient India. While writing the political history he discussed with great skill numerous difficult problems concerning the location of Indian cities and territories hitherto unknown.

Part II of *The Political History of Ancient India* deals with the period from the accession of Bimbisara to the extinction of the Gupta empire (*c.* 543 B.C.-550 A.D.). The purpose, as stated in the preface, was "to provide a history of the period from Bimbisara to the Guptas which will be, to a certain extent, more up-to-date, if less voluminous, than the classic work of Dr. Smith." In this section Dr. RayChaudhuri threw a welcome light on the date of Sisunaga, king of Magadha, and on the current theory about the disintegration of the mighty Maurya Empire. On the strength of Ceylonese chronicle (Mahavamsa lists) he placed Sisunaga long after Bimbisara who belonged to the Haryankakula. The Brahmanical reaction theory propounded by Pandit Haraprasad Sastri as supported by Asoka's edicts on *Dandasamata* and *Vyavahara Samata* and Pushyamitra as a militant Brahmanist has been ably controverted by a reference to Edicts Nos. 3, 4 and 5 which showed Asoka's anxiety for the well-being of the Brahmans. He also established on the combined testimony of Polybius and Kalhan that the dissolution of the Maurya empire began long before the invasion of the Hellenistic monarch Antiochus III in 206 B.C. and that the Greek invasion had nothing to do with the fall of the Mauryas. Dr. RayChaudhuri's arguments for holding Demetrius and not Menander as the Yavana invader in the time of Pushyamitra Sunga are sound enough. According to him Simuka was the founder of the Satavahana dynasty of the Deccan and Dr. RayChaudhuri chose on the Puranic evidence to place him in the 1st century B.C. and not towards the end of the 3rd century B.C., as was done by Rapson and Smith.

Dr. RayChaudhuri's *Political History* has won the admiration of Indian and foreign scholars alike. Prof. Wieh Geiger, Germany, observed, "We now are enabled by the author's penetrating researches to start the Indian Chronology from the 9th instead of the 6th or 5th century B.C." Prof. Berriedale Keith referred to it as "a most valuable contribution to the subject of which it treats." F. W. Thomas considered his writings as "models of sound judgment combined with full knowledge." Prof. E. W. Hopkins regarded his book as "a fine augury for Indian scholarship" and

Dr. L. D. Barnett opined: "The author treats his materials with a certain degree of originality, but at the same time he preserves throughout a well -balanced judgment and never sacrifices critical caution to the passion for novel theories." Prof. A. L. Basham writes, "The book is, in fact, a work of research, not only gathering together the data of early scholars, but making original contribution in almost every chapter." (Modern Historians of Ancient India, *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*).

II. His second major publication *Materials for the Study of Early History of the Vaishnava Sect*, published in 1936 (2nd edition), though small in size, shows his independent approach to the problems of religious history in ancient India. What is exceedingly interesting is his cogent arguments identifying Krishna of the Great Epic and Pauranic tradition—Devaki-putra Vasudeva Krishna—with Krishna, the disciple of Ghora Angirasa of the Chhandogya Upanishad. This little volume attracted the attention of Indologists all over the world. Sir George Grierson remarked, "The book is full of matter which is of great importance for the history of religion in India and will form a valued addition to my collection of books on the subject." Prof. Garbe, Tubingen, Germany, wrote: "I perfectly agree with you in the main points as to the personality of Krishna and the development of Bhagavadism." Prof. A. Berriedale Keith observed, "The stress laid on the epigraphic evidence and the full use made of it is of special value."

III. His *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, first published in 1932, is a collection of papers on various topics, such as cosmography, geography and chronology. The articles are all examples of his solid research work, remarkable alike in their originality of conception and breadth of vision. The articles on the "Antiquity of the Rigveda", "*Vanga Kon Desa*", the Puranic cosmography and the mountain system of the Puranas explaining the Indian conception of the Rikshavat, Suktimat and Vindhya ranges and "the inter-relation of the two Epics" deserve special mention. Referring to the first article Prof. Schrader, Kiel, Germany, said, "It is a sober and useful little piece of research work with which, on the whole, I fully agree."

Dr. RayChaudhuri was also the co-author with Drs. R. C. Majumdar and K. K. Datta of *An Advanced History of India* (2nd Edition, 1950). He contributed chapters I and III to XIV in part I. These are very useful for college students, written as they were by a specialist.

Other writings: Some of the articles written by Dr. RayChaudhuri and published in different journals are: (1) A Note on the Later Guptas, published in *JBORS*, Sept.-Dec., 1929; (2) The Decline of the Early Gupta Empire, published in the *Calcutta Review*, April, 1930; (3) The Lakshmana-sena Era, published in *Sir Asutosh Mookherjee Silver Jubilee Volumes*, vol. III, published by Calcutta University. This was one of the very interesting papers. According to one view (that of Dr. Kielhorn) the era current in

North Bihar and known as Lakshmana Samvat started from 1119-20 A.D. and marked the accession of Lakshmanasena, son of Ballalsena of Bengal. Dr. RayChaudhuri's contention was that the founder of the era must have been a different ruler. Relying on the Janibigha inscription of Jayasena, Lord of Pithi, he concluded that the king Lakshmanasena who founded the era "must have been the founder of the Sena dynasty of Pithi." It is necessary to bear in mind that according to Dr. R. C. Majumdar the date of Lakshmanasena's accession to the throne of Bengal was about 1179 A.D.[2]

Prof. RayChaudhuri contributed three very valuable and superbly written chapters to *The History of Bengal*, vol. I, edited by Dr. R. C. Majumdar and published by Dacca University in 1943. The first chapter deals with the physical and historical geography of Bengal and contains four useful maps, viz., (1) The British Province of Bengal, (2) Van Den Broecke's Map (1660 A.D.), (3) Ptolemy's Map—India within the Ganges, and (4) the map showing political divisions of ancient Bengal. These three chapters undoubtedly show Dr. RayChaudhuri's profound knowledge of and deep insight into the geography and history of ancient Bengal. Concerning the dated history as distinct from the legendary one, he wrote—"In the case of Bengal dated history begins only from 326 B.C. with the famous stand made by the warriors of the Gangaridai and the Prasioi to resist the threatening onslaught of Alexander who had advanced to the Hyphasis and was eager to penetrate deeper into the interior of India."[3] To the *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, published under the editorship of Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Dr. RayChaudhuri contributed two chapters: chapter I—India in the Age of the Nandas, and chapter IV—Chandragupta and Bindusara. These two are very illuminating chapters on the Nandas and Mauryas. A fuller treatment is nowhere to be found. Apart from a detailed account of the Nanda Empire and its extent, especially its southern boundary which was tentatively fixed at the river Godavari, we find here many interesting facts gleaned from classical writers about the administrative system of the Nanda Empire. He wrote, "Greek observers of the 4th century B.C. and epitomisers of a later age allude to a system of provincial government under officials styled nomarchs and hyparchs."

In chapter IV has been incorporated a full discussion on the ancestry of Chandragupta Maurya. All the theories about the origin of the Mauryas have been discussed including his own theory, viz., the Kshatriya origin of the Moriya and Maurya clan ruling over the little republic of Pipphalivana in Gorakpur district as early as the sixth century B.C.[3] Chandragupta's successor Bindusara, who is often described as "a shadowy figure in Indian history", was essentially a man of peace. The Tibetan historian Taranath, however, records some warlike activities of Bindusara and his chancellor, the Brahman Chanakya, leading to the submission of all territory between the eastern and western seas. Commenting on the above

statement Dr. RayChaudhuri argued, "No Greek or Indian record of any early date connects the name of Bindusara with the conquest of any large tract of peninsular India. Inscriptions of Kalinga and Mysore, which tell us so much about the Nandas, Chandragupta and Asoka, are silent about the second Maurya."[4]

It is a matter of common knowledge that the idea or the conception of history has varied from age to age. So far as the history of India is concerned, the idea of history in ancient India was different from that in medieval India with its profuse historical literature. As a matter of fact, ancient India suffered from lack of formal histories. The only work that goes by the name of history is Kalhana's *Rajatarangini* (1148-49 A.D.) and Dr. J. N. Sarkar rightly points out, "the standard set by Kalhana was not reached by any other Hindu historian of the medieval period, just as the lines chalked out by Ibn Khaldun do not appear to have been worked out by any other Arabic writer."[5] Medieval conception of history differed likewise from that in modern times. History in modern eyes has a double aspect. It is both a science and an art. The historian has, therefore, to be both a scientist and an artist with impartiality, accuracy, imagination and literary style at his command.[6] The historical method or methodology in history developed in the late 18th or 19th century. The writing of history involves two main operations, (*a*) to establish facts (all facts are not historical facts or events), and (*b*) to interpret them or draw conclusions from them. But drawing conclusions is a difficult process and the historian must go through such processes as (1) search for documents, (2) examination of documents, (3) explanation, (4) correlation, and (5) reciprocal relations of facts and their interaction.[7] Thus a most distinguished modern historian, E. H. Carr, writes, "History consists of a corpus of facts. The facts are available to the historian in documents, inscriptions and so on."[8] The same historian defines history as "a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts and an unending dialogue between the present and the past."[9]

Born as he was in the last decade of the nineteenth century, then in full tide of the Renaissance, Prof. Hem Chandra RayChaudhuri's idea of history and his method of writing were surely modern. For *Political History of Ancient India,* especially part I, he had to depend chiefly upon literary evidence, that bewildering mass of genealogies, traditions, myths and tales preserved in Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain writings, both canonical and non-canonical. Dr. RayChaudhuri took nothing on trust; he examined and re-examined every piece of literary evidence with extreme care and objectivity and drew conclusions in accordance with the canons of modern methodology. In the words of A. L. Basham, Dr. RayChaudhuri belonged to the school of Bhandarkar (Sir R. G.) and by his supreme effort tried to discover 'dry truth'. (*Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon,* p. 248).

It is very nearly correct to say that no personal factor or even a nation-

alist bias ever marred his writings. The third Maurya sovereign Asoka has been accorded by historians the highest place in the long roll of monarchs, ancient and modern. Dr. RayChaudhuri dwelt at great length on Asoka's reign and on the character and achievements of the greatest ruler of all times and all climes, but he did not, at the same time, fail to criticise Asoka's policy of Dharmavijaya and its effect on the fortunes of his empire. To quote his words: "The policy of Dharmavijaya which he formulated after the Kalinga war was not likely to promote the cause for which a long line of able sovereigns from Bimbisara to Bindusara had lived and struggled. The statesman, who turned civil administrators into religious propagandists, abolished hunting and joust of arms, entrusted the fierce tribesmen on the North-West frontier to the tender care of Superintendents of piety... certainly pursued a policy at which Chandragupta Maurya would have looked askance. India needed men of the calibre of Chandragupta and Puru to ensure her protection against the Yavana menace. She got a dreamer. Magadha after the Kalinga war frittered away her conquering energy in attempting a religious revolution, as Egypt did under the guidance of Ikhnaton."[10] Free from all bias, racial, provincial or religious, he proved a true historian.

It is rather difficult to say what influence Dr. RayChaudhuri had on contemporary historians, but he surely influenced to a large extent the early generations of his pupils in the post-graduate department of Ancient Indian History and Culture in Calcutta University. As a popular and successful teacher, he had enormous influence on his pupils, one of whom writes how he "became interested in Puranic cosmography and Indian Historical Geography as well as the Political History of South India after attending only a few of Hem Chandra's lectures in the post-graduate classes."[11] Some of his pupils like Dr. Hem Chandra Ray and Nanigopal Majumdar, and still later pupils like Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sircar and Dr. Sudhankar Chatterjee and others took up with zeal his line of research, and made and are still making notable contributions to the Indological studies. Following Dr. RayChaudhuri, Dr. Hem Chandra Ray, who was appointed a University teacher in 1920, specialising in the political history of ancient India, became the author of the *Dynastic History of Northern India* (*c.* 600-1200 A.D.), published by Calcutta University in two volumes in 1931 and 1936. Thus the entire political history of ancient India has been covered by the valuable works of Dr. RayChaudhuri and Dr. H. C. Ray except perhaps the history of South India in its entirety which has been ably presented to the public by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri in his *History of South India*, published in 1955. Scholars of different Indian Universities who drew inspiration from Prof. RayChaudhuri have brought out several research publications of considerable value on political, religious and cultural history and Indian epigraphy.

The University of Calcutta enjoys the honour of having first introduced regular courses of study and research in different branches of Ancient Indian History and Culture. The lead taken by the Calcutta University was followed by other Indian Universities like Banaras, Mysore, Allahabad, Lucknow and Patna, etc. The recent expansion of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture of Calcutta University and the establishment in 1964 of the Centre for Advanced Study in Ancient Indian History and Culture are the direct outcome of the atmosphere of study and research created by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar and Prof. Hem Chandra Ray-Chaudhuri and the band of promising students and researchers initiated and trained by them.

In recent years the study of Indian history has taken a new and unexpected turn. Formerly the writing of political and dynastic histories alone of ancient India engaged the attention of scholars and orientalists. From the second quarter of the 20th century the writing of social history has come to the fore with the availability of archaeological data which, as is well known, help reconstruction of the social and cultural history more than the political. A young scholar rightly observes, "The study of society has also stimulated an interest in comparative studies, not along the old lines of declaring one culture to be the norm and judging others by its standards, but rather in terms of a comparative analysis of many cultures. It is this approach which has made historical studies such as Marc Bloch's work on European feudalism relevant to the intellectual equipment of the historian of India." Dr. H. C. RayChaudhuri is, it may be argued, a link between the two sets of historians. We have already seen that he was primarily a political historian. Nevertheless, he showed by his diverse interest and intellectual equipment the way to the specialised study of socio-economic and socio-religious history of ancient India. His contributions in this field are undeniable.

The death of Dr. RayChaudhuri after protracted illness on the 4th of May, 1957, was an irreparable loss to Indology. He was an indefatigable scholar. In the revised editions of his magnum opus (*The Political History of Ancient India*) he incorporated, in spite of his ill-health, all important matters in the light of latest research, carefully adding supplementary notes to the subject or subjects already touched upon. His style of writing was simple, and "if generalisation is not foreign to history and if history thrives on generalisations", as Prof. E. H. Carr[12] puts it, Dr. RayChaudhuri's generalisations were indeed inspiring. We quote here one instance: "In B.C. 326 the flood of Macedonian invasion had overwhelmed the Indian States of the Punjab, and was threatening to burst upon the Madhyadesa. Agrammes was confronted with a crisis not unlike that which Arminius had to face when Varus carried the Roman Eagle to the Teutoburg Forest, or which Charles Martel had to face when the Saracens carried the Crescent

towards the field of Tours. The question whether India was, or was not, to be Hellenised awaited decision."[13]

We conclude by saying that if adherence to truth, balanced judgment, clarity of expression and depth of knowledge be the marks of a historian, Dr. Hem Chandra RayChaudhuri is a historian par excellence.

REFERENCES

1. Sir J. N. Sarkar, *India through the Ages*, 5th ed., p. 69.
2. *History of Bengal*, vol. I (Dacca), p. 218.
3. The theory developed in the *Political History of Ancient India*, 5th ed., pp. 267-68.
4. *The Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, Banaras, 1952, p. 168.
5. Dr. J. N. Sarkar, "Ideas of History in Medieval India", *The Quarterly Review of Historical Studies*, vol. IV., nos. 1-2, p. 21.
6. J. T. Shotwell, *The History of History*, pp. 9-11
7. *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, pp. 362-63.
8. E. H. Carr, *What is History?*, p. 9.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
10. Dr. H. C. RayChaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 5th ed., pp. 347-48.
11. Dr. D. C. Sircar, *The Quarterly Review of Historical Studies*, vol. II, nos. 3-4, 1962-63, p. 141.
12. E. H. Carr, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
13. Dr. H. C. RayChaudhuri, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

PRABODH CHANDRA BAGCHI

DR. H. P. CHAKRAVORTI

(Visva-Bharati University)

PRABODH CHANDRA BAGCHI, son of Harinath Bagchi, was born on November 18, 1898 in a middle-class family of Srikol in Jessore district in Bengal (now in Bangladesh). His ancestral home was in the district of Khulna (Bangladesh). Unfortunately he lost his mother, when a child.

He passed the Entrance examination from Magura High School in 1914, came to the house of his maternal uncle at Krishnagar and graduated with Honours in Sanskrit from Krishnagar College in 1918. He passed the M.A. Examination in Ancient Indian History and Culture in 1920 from Calcutta University and secured the first place in the first class. Almost immediately after, he was appointed a lecturer in his own subject in the post-graduate department of Calcutta University. It may be noted that he married Sm. Panna Devi at this stage.

Rabindranath established his international university of Visva-Bharati at Santiniketan in 1921 and from its inception he was eager to start Chinese studies in his ashrama. Professor Sylvain Lévi of Paris University was invited by Tagore to Visva-Bharati and as a Visiting Professor he taught both Chinese and Tibetan. It is worth mentioning that Shri Vidhusekhar Sastri, Professor of Sanskrit at Visva-Bharati, with a number of his colleagues and pupils, joined Professor Lévi's class. Thus was formed the nucleus of the school of Chinese and Tibetan studies. Fortunately in the same year Sir Asutosh Mukherjee sent Shri Bagchi to the newly started centre of Oriental Studies at Santiniketan to study Buddhism and the Chinese language. This served as a golden opportunity for Bagchi's brilliant academic success in future.

Shri Bagchi had already begun to read Chinese with a Japanese teacher of Calcutta University. So when be became a pupil of Professor Lévi, he proved himself more advanced than others in the class and earnestly devoted himself to Chinese study. Professor Lévi was so pleased to see a remarkably efficient student in Shri Bagchi as to love and take interest in him like a son. Shri Bagchi went to Nepal with Professor Lévi, worked on Buddhist scriptures and culture there and carried on researches on manuscripts at the Nepal Durbar Library. Owing to Professor Lévi's eagerness Shri Bagchi went with him in 1922 to Indo-China and Japan as Sir Rashbehari Ghosh Travelling Fellow of Calcutta University. Thence he had occasion to travel through Cambodia, Annam or Vietnam and Cochin-China or Champa. During this travel and sojourn in the countries

of South-East Asia and the Far East Prabodh Chandra studied and discussed with his master the history of Asia and of Buddhism and the Chinese language. Thus he gained a first-hand knowledge of Greater India and came back to his country only to start again for Paris in 1923 with a Government of India scholarship for which Rabindranath had exerted his influence.

Shri Bagchi was in Paris from 1923 to 1926 when he studied with greater interest, under Professor Lévi, Professor Pélliot and other savants of Paris University, the Tibetan and Chinese languages and Buddhist texts, and carried on regular research on Buddhist culture, as a result of which his thesis, *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine, les traducteurs et les traductions* was published from Paris in 1926. It may be noted that *Deux Lexiques Sanskrit-Chinois* formed a supplementary part of his main thesis. His labour was amply rewarded, as the University of Paris conferred upon him the highest degree of a Docteur-es-Lettres for this thesis in 1926.

Dr. Bagchi came back home with academic honours from Paris in 1926 and resumed his duty as a Lecturer in his *alma mater*. The University of Calcutta published his thesis in a series known as Sino-Indica. The *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, Tome I, and the *Deux Lexiques Sanskrit-Chinois*, Tome I, were published in 1927 and 1929 respectively. It may be mentioned here that the Japanese scholar B. Nanjyo had already published from Oxford University *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka* which has ever since been appreciated as the most valuable source book for the study of Chinese and Japanese Buddhism. Prabodh Chandra's work in this branch of Buddhist learning is also equally, if not more, valuable for his compilation of systematic history of the vast literature of these Chinese translations with the chronology of the translators, both Indian and Chinese. His brief notes on these works of translation and his biographical notes on Indian scholars who worked in China are also a mine of information of historical value. The book *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine* is an inventory of Chinese Tripitaka classified according to regions and periods. The first part is devoted to the Buddhist monasteries of the North (68-581 A.D.) and the second part to those of the South (222-589 A.D.) with extensive notes on their literary activities, the life and writings of the principal missionaries. The history of the penetration of Buddhism into China is given in the Introduction. The second volume contains the history of translators and translations till 1368 A.D. "It also gives us an account of the non-canonical works, compiled in China and Japan till the latest period, the works that are of help to the study of Buddhist literature."

The Chinese Buddhist pilgrims came over to India to study Sanskrit and they had developed their own method of teaching Sanskrit in China. As a part of this method they composed small Sanskrit-cum-Chinese dictionaries evidently for the beginners. Shri Bagchi came across two such dictionaries of *c.* 7th and 8th century A.D. and they were published in

facsimile from the Japanese editions of the 18th century, showing the Chinese words and their equivalents in Sanskrit in the 7th century script of North India known as the *Siddhamatrika*, with pronunciation in Chinese characters and Japanese Kana syllabary indicated by the side of each Sanskrit syllable. His notes on these two lexicons are of much importance from the linguistic point of view.

Dr. Bagchi went to Nepal for the second time in 1929 to collect the *Charyapadas* and *Dohas*. He came across a fragmentary palm-leaf manuscript of the *dohas* of Saraha, containing the date 220 Nepal era, i.e. 1100 A.D. He discovered another manuscript containing two *dohas*, one of Tillopada and the other of Saraha.

Prabodh Chandra exhibited his mastery in linguistic science in the Introduction to his *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India*. He was closely associated with the work of the Linguistic Society of India, both as a member of the editorial board of its journal and as a high office-bearer for some years. The book *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India* contains some valuable articles by scholars like S. Lévi, J. Bloch and J. Przyluski, rendered into English by Dr. Bagchi. It was published in 1929 by Calcutta University. Prabodh Chandra introduces us here to the works on Linguistics to show the relation between the Munda and the Mon-Khmer groups and establish the existence of a linguistic family known as Austric. His observation that not only linguistic but also certain cultural and political facts of ancient India can be explained by admitting an Austro-Asiatic element is worth noting. In collaboration with Dr. Bagchi, Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee also draws our attention here to 'Some more Austric words in Indo-Aryan' which are really "of great significance in the study of the origins of the Hindu people and Hindu culture of North India."

Dr. Bagchi's next work, *Kaula-jnana-nirnaya* and some minor texts of the school of *Matsyendranatha*, was published by Calcutta Sanskrit Series in 1934. It is a critical edition of Sanskrit texts, discovered in Nepal in 1921 and 1929 with introduction and notes. These texts show a medley of doctrines, preached by Brahmanical and Buddhist Tantras. Tradition claims Matsyendranatha to be the first teacher of Hathayoga of which some of the *asanas* and *mudras* are associated with his name. Other elements of this yoga are also mentioned in these texts. Dr. Bagchi shows the similarity between the verse of the Kaula-jnana-nirnaya, III. 2-3 and that of the Hathayoga, IV. 14 defining the doctrine of Kula. Dr. Bagchi, after an examination of various legends, concludes that Matsyendranatha and his school "originated, say, about 900 A.D. and flourished in Bengal and most probably in East Bengal."

Dr. Bagchi's Introduction to *Adhyatma-Ramayana*, published by Calcutta Sanskrit Series in 1935, is also very interesting and instructive. It draws our attention to the twofold character of the text, that of a Purana and of a Tantra, and ascribes the composition of this work to the 15th century A.D.,

in between the period of Ramananda and Tulsidas. To quote Dr. Bagchi, "the Adhyatma-Ramayana is an attempt to supply a purely monistic basis of the Ramaite cult" (*Adhyatma-Ramayana*, p. 77).

The same year (1935) witnessed the first publication of *Dohakosa*, containing dohas of Tillopada, Saraha, and Kanhapada with notes and translations by Dr. Bagchi, from Calcutta University.

In 1937 Dr. Bagchi presided over the Teachers' Conference of Howrah at Maju and also over the Fourth Conference of Divya-Smriti-Utsava on the 6th of Chaitra, 1344 B.S., at Bhimer Gadh, Badargunj, in Rangpur. The second volume of his *Deux Lexiques Sanskrit-Chinois*, in which he gives us full accounts of these two works and their authors and the words are submitted to orthographical, linguistic and lexicographical survey, was published this year.

In 1938 *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, Tome II, was published in the Sino-Indica series of Calcutta University and this established Dr. Bagchi's reputation as an eminent Sinologist of modern India.

His researches were fruitful in the study of old Bengali Charyapadas by comparing them with their Tibetan versions. The original texts of the Charyapadas came out first in 1938 in the *Journal of the Department of Letters* (vol. 30), Calcutta University, under the title of 'Materials for a Critical Edition of the Old Bengali Charyapadas'. It may be noted here that the *Charya-giti-kosa*, edited by Dr. Bagchi in collaboration with Santi Bhiksu, came out in 1956 from Visva-Bharati. The *Dohakosa*, also edited jointly by them, was published in 1938 by Calcutta Sanskrit Series. It represents the Apabhramsa texts of the Sahajiya School with chhaya and Sanskrit commentary on some portions. Nearly 140 dohas were already edited by Dr. Sahidullah and Dr. Bagchi made an improvement on them, collecting 66 new sayings of Sahajayana mystics and 25 more from other sources. The *Dohakosa* is a pretty comprehensive collection of doctrines, followed by mystics of *c.* 1000 A.D. Apart from some suggestion of alternate readings in Tillopada's dohas made by Shri Manomohan Ghosh (*Indian Historical Quarterly*, XVI, 1940, vol. 2, pp. 861-62), Dr. Bagchi's reconstruction of the text leaves little room for improvement. It is interesting to note that in the article 'The Sibilants in the Buddhist Doha', published in *Indian Linguistics*, vol. 2 (1935-44), pp. 60-63, he rejects the theory of M. Sahidullah who takes the language of the dohas to be an Eastern Apabhramsa and on the phonetic ground of the use of only one sibilant that is always dental in the manuscripts, establishes his own that the language is Western Apabhramsa, adopted by the Buddhist scholars of Magadha for writing their texts between the 8th and 10th century A.D.

It may be noted here that Dr. Bagchi presided over the Greater Bengal section of the Sixteenth Conference of Pravasi-Vanga-Sahitya at Gauhati in 1938; and also in the Third Conference of Bengali Literature of all Burma in 1939. In 1939 he presided over the Burma Bengali Library

Conference in Rangoon. The year 1939 witnessed the publication of another interesting book, *Studies in the Tantras*, part I, by the University of Calcutta. This book is a collection of some articles (published earlier in *Indian Historical Quarterly* and *Calcutta Oriental Journal* between 1930 and 1934) which contain the results of Dr. Bagchi's examination of manuscripts of the Nepal Durbar Library collection in 1929. In the article 'On some Tantrik texts studied in Ancient Kambuja' Dr. Bagchi draws our attention to the inscription of Sdok Kak Thom (BEFEO, XV, pp. 70-71), discovered in the province of Sesophon, Cambodia, which mentions "the introduction of the mystic cult of Devaraja along with some Tantrik texts in Kambuja during the reign of King Jayavarman II who came to the throne in the Saka year 724 (802 A.D.)". It is interesting to note that this inscription mentions four sastras, Sirascheda, Vinasikha, Sammoha and Nayottara as the four faces of Tumburu, who was, according to Dr. Bagchi, no other than Siva himself. Here Prabodh Chandra gives us a vivid picture of the Tantrik literature, specially the *Nihsvasa-tattva-Samhita*, throwing light on the texts introduced into Kambuja in *c.* 802 A.D. He shows also that the above four texts are of North-Indian origin, studied in India in the 7th-8th centuries A.D., if not earlier, and they influenced the culture of ancient Cambodia to a large extent. In 'Further Notes' on the same texts Dr. Bagchi shows the influence of the Agamas of North India in the Saivite cult, practised in Kambuja and Champa, as evidenced by details of *linga*-worship in numerous inscriptions. He would have us believe that Jayavarman II was a Saiva and that though the sculpture of the temple of Bayon seems partly to be Mahayanist, it was originally Saiva in character. In the 'Sandhabhasa and Sandhavacana' Dr. Bagchi, agreeing with Professor Vidhusekhar Sastri, says that the term means an "intentional speech" (neyartha), i.e. a symbolical language to signify "something different from what is expressed by words", as found in the later Buddhist texts belonging to the Vajrayana and the Sahajayana. The *Hevajra-tantra* contains a chapter on the Sandhabhasa, characterised as the Mahasamaya of the Yogis and also as the Mahabhasam, full of the meaning of doctrines. Next, the article 'On the Sadhanamala' discusses the merits and defects of Dr. Bhattacharya's edition of the same. It is pointed out that many verses of the *Prajnopaya-vinischaya-siddhi* are unintelligible to us without the proper guidance of the guru and Dr. Bhattacharya's literal translation is positively wrong. These texts should be read in the light of the *Hevajra-tantra* which gives us clue to the real significance of some of the technical terms like *lalana*, *rasana*, *avadhuti* and *mudra*. Dr. Bagchi places Uddiyana, a Tantrik pitha, in the Swat Valley. He appreciates the value of this work for the chronology of Vajrayana and authors of the Sadhanas. Our attention is drawn to the essential identity of the two goddesses: Ekajata of the Sadhana No. 127 and Mahachina-Krama-Tara in Sadhanas Nos. 100 and 101 corresponding to Tara and Ugratara, Ekajata and Mahani-

lasarasvati of the Hindu pantheon. In the article 'On Foreign Elements of the Tantra' Dr. Bagchi divides Tantras into two classes, orthodox and heterodox: the former is represented by the Agamas, Yamalas and their supplements, while the latter comprises both Buddhist and Brahmanical products of schools like Kulachara, Vamachara, Sahajayana, Vajrayana, etc. Here he points out that the mystic practices of foreign origin crept into the later-class Tantras, as evidenced by the Kubjika, Tara and Sammoha Tantras and also by the Jayadratha-Yamala. In 'Some Technical Terms of the Tantras' our attention is drawn to the significance of some technical terms like Chandra-Surya, Camana-Dhamana, etc. (used in the Brahmanical and Buddhist Tantras of mysticism, specially in the *Charyapadas* and *Dohakosa*), which can be explained with the help of Hevajra and Heruka Tantras. His article 'Buddhist Mysticism in the Charyapadas' brings out the mystic doctrines of the *Charyapadas* expressed by a number of images like those of a boat, a rat, *vina*, elephant, etc., which imply certain yogic processes for the cultivation of the bodhichitta of the Mahayanists. His 'Notes on the word Paravritti' is equally interesting, as he explains this term of the *Sutralankara* as "turning (the functions of the mind) round to an opposite direction", amounting to a mental revolution. He says that the phrase 'maithunasya paravrittau, etc.' means nothing but "the enjoyment of bliss similar to that arising from that act". He concludes the book with an appendix where he added detailed notices on some of the manuscripts of the Nepal Durbar Library: *Nihsvasa-tattva-samhita*, *Sammoha Tantra*, *Brahma-Yamala*, *Pingalamata* and *Jayadratha-Yamala*.

In 1943 Dr. Bagchi presided over the Ancient Indian section of the Indian History Congress held at Aligarh, where he delivered an address on 'The Role of Central Asian Nomads in Indian History', published later in *The Greater India Society Journal*, 1943. Here he admits the utility of the Chinese sources for information on the movements of the Central Asian nomads but attaches greater importance to the Indian literature than to the texts of the classical writers. Dr. Bagchi tried to solve the problems of India's history, viz., those of the Sakas, the Tukharas, the Yue-ches, the Murundas, the Hunas and the Turks and to show the permanent contributions of these nomads to India's culture.

In 1944 Dr. Bagchi published his book *India and China* and started to edit and publish a quarterly journal entitled the *Sino-Indian Studies* from Calcutta on his own initiative. The book *India and China* gives us an account of a thousand years of cultural relations between India and China; and the aforesaid journal begins to trace the beginnings of Buddhism in China and show that "although during the first four centuries of Buddhist missionary activities in China, the lead was taken by the Buddhist scholars of Iran and of countries in Central Asia, Indian Buddhist scholars did not fail to make their presence felt in China and create among the Chinese an interest in Buddhism and Indian Culture in general which would not

have been otherwise possible." In *India and China* Dr. Bagchi traces the routes to China, both by land and sea and the first contact of the two peoples. Here we find that the Sino-Indian relations had not always been a one-way traffic; we have also taken many things from China just as China has taken from us. Hence he deals with the movement of Buddhist missionaries of India to China and also of ancient Chinese pilgrims to India. The book is made more popular by annexing in the Appendix I three letters of Hiuen-Tsang and his Indian friends written originally in Sanskrit and rendered here into English, which throw considerable light on the personal ties that existed between them; and by adding in the Appendix II five Chinese inscriptions of Bodhgaya, rendered into English, which show the deep regard of the monks and also of the emperor of China. Indian scholars were already acquainted with Charles Eliot's account of Sino-Indian relationship in the field of Buddhism (*Hinduism and Buddhism*, vol. III). Dr. Bagchi made available for the first time a complete picture of Sino-Indian contact in religion as well as in secular matters to the Indian scholars. Here he shows that China could not remain contented only with Buddhism but took interest in other elements of Indian culture, such as art, astronomy, mathematics, medicine, etc. A synthesis of two civilisations is its another interesting topic wherein he discusses how two different peoples like the Chinese and the Indians, living in different climes, speaking different languages and possessing different traditions of culture and religion, "could meet on a common platform" to work for a common civilisation because "the cultural and social ideals of the two people had many things in common." In a nutshell, Dr. Bagchi inaugurated the study of Sinology in India. He fully appreciated the works of western sinologists and left no stones unturned to utilise the Chinese sources for the reconstruction of ancient history of India.

The *Sino-Indian Studies* is an important journal for the study of Sino-Indian culture. Among others deserving mention are a few articles by Dr. Bagchi. 'The Beginnings of Buddhism in China' in volume I, part I, traces the contributions of early scholars and monks of India, Persia, Indo-Scythia and Sogdia to the spread of Buddhism in China. The 'Vajragarbha-tantra-raja-sutra' (in volume I) traces the origin of the Vajrayana to the king Indrabodhi. In 'Chinese Coins of the Song period' Dr. Bagchi ascribes most of these coins to the Song period (11th-13th century A.D.) and only three to the earlier period (713-42 A.D.). All the coins prove the commercial link between China and South India in the period concerned. 'The Sino-Indian Relations in the Period of the United Empire (I) and (II)' portrays the relations between India and China. Dr. Bagchi gives us a correct reading and a revised rendering of the Chinese inscriptions, set up by Che-yi, ascribed to *c.* 981-990 A.D., at Bodhgaya in 'New Lights on the Chinese Inscriptions of Bodhgaya'. 'The Bodhi-sattva-Sila of Subhakara-simha' (in volume I) throws light on the *Wu Wei San tsang Ch'an Yeo*, a

Chinese text, a collection of the Mahayana teachings of an Indian teacher Subhakarasinha (8th century A.D.). In 'Kipin and Kashmir' in volume II, Kipin, as mentioned in Chinese records up to the advent of the Sui (581 A.D.), is identified with Kashmir but Kipin of the later periods was Kapisa. Dr. Bagchi's depth of knowledge in history, geography and linguistics is proved by 'Ptolemy, the Niddesa and the Brihatkatha' (vol. I) in which he discusses in detail the identification of many places and paths, mentioned therein. Another article in volume II draws our attention to *Chango so che lu* (*Jneya-prakasa-sastra*), translated from Tibetan into Chinese. The original was a text on Abhidharma, written by Saskya Pandit of Tibet (13th century A.D.). From 'The Geographical Catalogue of the Yaksas in the Mahamayuri' we learn of the magical value of the Mahamayuri, one of five famous formulae of Northern Buddhism.

In 1945 Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi joined Visva-Bharati as the Director of the Cheena-Bhavana. He built up a new Research Department as well as the Department of Chinese studies here. Now he started editing and publishing the *Visva-Bharati Annals* from this University, aiming at two things: Buddhistic and historical studies. He wanted to restore in English or Sanskrit the ancient Chinese, Tibetan or other translations of Buddhist texts of which the originals are lost and to publish critical editions of Pali and Sanskrit texts after comparing different versions of the same text. He had in view the study of ancient and medieval Chinese accounts of India throwing light on the political and cultural history of India, that of the records of Buddhist travellers and of their translations and also that of the Chinese texts bearing on the history and geography of India, Central Asia and China. This work served as an inspiration to scholars of Visva-Bharati whose research articles were published in seven volumes under his supervision (1945-55). In a valuable 'Note on the Avadanasataka and its Chinese translation' Dr. Bagchi proves by the process of comparison that the original text was much shorter than the Sanskrit one which is now extant. He points out the numerous stereotyped passages which are commonly explained as a stylistic feature characteristic of ancient Buddhist texts but are actually later embellishments (*Visva-Bharati Annals*, I, 1945, pp. 56-61). His article 'Political Relations between Bengal and China in the Pathan Period' is of historical interest (*ibid.*, pp. 96 ff). In collaboration with Mr. H. Wu he translated a number of Chinese texts bearing on the relations between China, Bengal and Jaunpur. The study of these records helped him in clearing some of the chronological tangles in the history of Bengal of the 15th century A.D. He collected and translated several sections of the ancient Chinese annals bearing on the history and geography of India during the first four centuries of the Christian era. His translation of a Chinese account of India *She-Kia-fang-che* (the Land of the Sakyas), compiled by Tao-siuan in the 7th century A.D., is interesting as a piece of a systematic geography of Central Asia and India. Dr. Bagchi and Mr. H.

Wu took up the study of a text of Chinese geography: *Shuei King Chu* (the Book of Rivers) of *c.* 3rd century A.D. with a commentary, made in the 5th century A.D., throwing considerable light on the geography of Central Asia, North-West India and North-West China.

In 1946 Dr. Bagchi presided over the Pali and Buddhist section of the 13th All India Oriental Conference held at Nagpur. His presidential address, 'On the Original Buddhism, Its Canon and Language,' was printed in the *Sino-Indian Studies* (vol. II, pp. 107-35). It tries to explain the relation of Pali with Buddhism. Here he throws light on the localisation of Paisachi on the basis of the Buddhist text called 'Fo San mei King', translated into Chinese in *c.* 3rd or 4th century A.D., which states that "In Taksasila the people of the Kingdom spoke the Paisachi language." He shows that in early times there were more than one school with the name of Sthaviravada and one of them had its literature in Paisachi adaptation. The original language of the Buddha-vachana was Magadhi. But Pali cannot be equated with it on phonetic grounds. Hence he observes that Pali is basically a Western Prakrita and agrees with the Girnar version of Asoka's edicts, but there are influences of other dialects on Pali, specially of Magadhi and Paisachi. "Sanskrit and Pali were both inheritors of an older literary tradition recorded in a dialect, now lost to us."

In 1947 Dr. Bagchi was sent to the University of Peking as a Visiting Professor of Indology for two years. This helped him to come in closer touch with some of the most renowned Professors in Peking and he returned home with fresher knowledge in the subject.

In 1948 Prabodh Chandra was appointed Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture at Visva-Bharati and Principal of Vidya-Bhavana.

His *Discourses on Buddhism* are essentially based on some lectures delivered in Peking in 1948 (reprinted from *Visva-Bharati Quarterly*, 1949), dealing with Buddhism and ancient Indian thought, Buddhism as the first popular and theistic religion, Hinayana and Mahayana, and place of Buddhism in Indian life. It may be added here that Prabodh Chandra delivered some lectures at the National Council of Education, Bengal, during 1949-51 as the Hemchandra Basu Mallik Professor of Indian History.

Three books in Bengali entitled *Bharat O Indo-Chin*, *Bharat O Madhya-desa* and *Bharat O Chin* were reprinted in 1950 by Visva-Bharati. They opened the eyes of the Bengalee readers to the facts of history and geography of Central Asia, China and South-East Asia.

The year 1951 witnessed the publication of the second edition of *India and China* in which Dr. Bagchi added a new chapter 'China and India' to the original book to show Chinese influence on Indian life and thought. The same year the Government of India took over the charge of Visva-Bharati as a centrally administered University. Next year his *Bauddha Dharma-sahitya* was reprinted by the Visva-Bharati. In 1952 Dr. Bagchi was

sent again to China as a member of a Cultural Mission for a few weeks. In 1954 Prabodh Chandra was elected Vice-Chancellor of Visva-Bharati and he dedicated himself wholeheartedly to its service.

His last book *India and Central Asia*, comprising lectures delivered by him as Hemchandra Basu Mallik Professor, was published in 1955 by the National Council of Education, Bengal. It gives us an outline history of the ancient cultural relations between India and Central Asia. It deals with (i) Nomadic movement of Central Asia, (ii) Tokharestan and Eastern Iran, (iii) Eastern Turkestan, the Southern states, (iv) the Northern states of the same region, and (v) language and literature of this area in five consecutive chapters. The Appendix reproduces three of his old articles, in one of which he establishes that Culika-Paisachi was a variety of North-western Prakrita, spoken by the Sogdians, on both linguistic and historical grounds.

It is difficult to review in this short space the innumerable articles which Dr. Bagchi contributed to different journals and papers, as listed in the Bibliography of Dr. P. C. Bagchi's works in the publication *Prabodh Chandra Bagchi* of Visva-Bharati Alumni Association, 1956. At least three of them deserve special mention: (i) the chapter on Religion in the *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas* edited by Nilakanta Sastri in 1952, (ii) Cultural Relations with E. Turkestan and China in *A New History of the Indian People*, volume IV, edited by Majumdar and Altekar, and (iii) the chapter on 'Religion of Bengal' in the *History of Bengal*, volume I (Dacca University). All these writings are meant for the clearer exposition of different aspects of culture, not only of India but also of the entire Eastern world.

Dr. Bagchi breathed his last on January 19, 1956.

As regards the methodology of Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, it may be pointed out that he was trained by his teacher, Professor Lévi, in the method of comparing Sanskrit texts with their Chinese and Tibetan translations which, in many cases, is the only way of settling the readings and interpreting the texts critically. He also utilised the archaeological and other evidences, whenever needed, in the execution of his work. His knowledge of various languages, viz., Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrits, Chinese, Tibetan, French and English, as also of their literatures and his command of a proper lucid style in exposition, stood him in great stead in the research work he seriously took up as the mission of his life. He knew that it was not possible to reconstruct India's history from Indian literature alone, because Indians of antiquity left hardly any written record of their achievements, which can be considered history in the true sense of the term. Besides, most of the ancient works are partly lost, but they are preserved only in Chinese and Tibetan translations. That is why he turned to these sources.

As to the influence on contemporary and later historians, it is enough to keep in mind the spirit of enthusiasm he had instilled in his pupils and

colleagues of both the Universities of Calcutta and Visva-Bharati, as evidenced by the series of Sino-Indica, Sino-Indian Studies and *Visva-Bharati Annals* which he had edited with the full co-operation of many scholars of the age.

Dr. Bagchi possessed an extremely loving nature. His simple and unassuming life was a thing rarely to be seen in these days. M. Louis Renou remarks: "Je le considérais comme un ami, comme le plus charmant et le plus délicat des Indiens." (I considered him to be a friend, the most charming and the most delicate of the Indians.) Prabodh Chandra received, by dint of his intellect and character as well as amiability, the love and affection, due to a son, from Professor and Madame Lévi. He was the secretary of the Indian students' association in Paris. He was always eager to help the Indian students in Paris, whenever they required help, and for this purpose he raised a fund with contributions from Indian merchants living there. Immediately after accepting the post of Vice-Chancellor he offered a voluntary cut of Rs. 250/- per month from his salary to be spent for the benefit of poor students. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee writes about him: "I was feeling greater and greater respect for Prabodh Chandra, the scholar, and at the same time no one could avoid Prabodh Chandra the man.... In many matters relating to life and the world outside life, about the Ultimate Reality there were points of agreement between Prabodh Chandra and myself.... Deep scholarship had not in any way acted as a load on his natural sweetness of temper. But one also noted that with all his simplicity, Prabodh Chandra had a vein of independence in him; and for that reason he was never inclined upon cultivating those in authority who had the gift of preferment and official favour in their control" (*Indian Linguistics*, vol. 18, 1957, p. 7). The lamp is out but we hope the light he lit will ever illuminate us all.

GHULAM YAZDANI

DR. H. K. SHERWANI

(Osmania University)

GHULAM YAZDANI was born at Delhi on March 22, 1885. His father, Ghulam Jilani, was a scholar of Persian and used to give lessons in Urdu and Persian to newly-appointed Indian Civil Service officers who were posted to the Upper Provinces. He had also served as Diwan or Chief Minister of Dujana State, an erstwhile Pathan principality in the Rohtak district of the present day Haryana prant. Yazdani's grandfather, Muhammad Salabat, was the kotwal of Rohtak city, while his great-grandfather, Muhammad 'Arif, served with Lord Lake in the campaign against the Raja of Bharatpur.

The family lived in a house in Churiwalan which once belonged to Raja of Nalagarh. His mother, Makholi Begam, gave birth to four sons and four daughters, of whom Ghulam Yazdani was the second son. He was married in 1909 to Badr Jahan Begam, daughter of Shah 'Abdu's-Samad, a descendant of Hazrat Shaikh Salim Chishti who lies buried in the uniquely beautiful marble mausoleum at Fatehpur Sikri, the palace built by the Emperor Akbar twenty-three miles from Agra.

The family, which had considerable influence in the court of Bahadur Shah Zafar, fell from its affluence on the fall of Delhi in 1857, and it is related that young Yazdani had sometimes to go and study under street lamps and later, to bear the expenses of his schooling partly out of the scholarships which he managed to annex.

On leaving the municipal school where he had his early education, Yazdani joined St. Stephen's College as a merit scholar, and while there he had the advantage of coming in contact with distinguished men of letters, such as Rev. J. G. F. Day, who rose to be the Primate of all Ireland in later years, and Rev. C. F. Andrews, who earned the name of *Deenabandhu* and who became a close associate of Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore. Another savant who exercised a marked influence on young Yazdani was Shamsul 'Ulama Maulvi Nazeer Ahmad, whose rendering of the Qur'an in idiomatic Urdu marks an epoch in the history of Muslim scholarship in India. It was in fact on the recommendation of Maulvi Nazeer Ahmad that Yazdani was appointed a lecturer in Persian at the St. Stephen's College. This was not due to any favouritism on the part of the authorities but to his brilliant career at school and college. He had topped the list of successful candidates in his Intermediate and B.A. examinations and was awarded the much coveted Macleod Gold Medal, the Aitchison Gold

Medal and the Jamalu'd-din Gold Medal. He thought it was a set-back when he was able to secure only a second class in his M.A. examination, but this failure to top the list stimulated Yazdani to greater success, and he was able to annex the Griffiths Prize of the Calcutta University.

It may thus be said that during the earlier part of his life Yazdani was influenced by such well-known scholars as Rev. J. G. F. Day, Rev. C. F. Andrews and Shamsu'l-'Ulama Maulvi Nazeer Ahmad.

In November 1905 Ghulam Yazdani was awarded the Government of India Scholarship for researches in Arabic and Persian and as such he had the opportunity of working with world-renowned Orientalists like Sir E. Denison Ross and Dr. Josef Horowitz who must have influenced him a great deal. He had not to work long as a lecturer at St. Stephen's College, for in 1909 he was selected by Mr. (later Sir Henry) Sharp as Professor of Arabic at the Government College, Rajsahi (now in Bangladesh). In 1913 his services were requisitioned from the Government of Bengal by the Government of Panjab, and he was appointed Professor of Arabic at the Government College, Lahore. But again he was not at Lahore for long, for on the recommendation of Sir John Marshall, Director-General of Archaeology, Government of India, he was appointed Superintendent of the newly-created Department of Archaeology of H.E.H. the Nizam's Dominions, later becoming its first Director, a post which he held right up to his retirement in 1943.

It was not merely the charge of a graduation class at a College or the headship of a large department which may be recounted in Yazdani's life; it was rather his dynamic personality which made him known in learned circles. Wherever he went he actively encouraged historical and archaeological research by founding research associations. Thus while he was a professor at Rajsahi he assisted local scholars in founding the Varendra Research Society; at Lahore he was one of the prime movers in the foundation of the Panjab Historical Society; at Hyderabad he was able to found the Hyderabad Archaeological Society which was later expanded to include history and came to be called the Hyderabad Archaeological and Historical Society.

In 1911 the Asiatic Society of Bengal entrusted him with the work of editing the voluminous chronicle of Shah Jahan's reign called *'Alam-i-Swaleh* by Muhammad Swaleh Kambo. While in Hyderabad he was instrumental in the preservation of the world-famed Ajanta Frescoes from decay with the help of two eminent Italians, Professor Cecconi and Count Orsini. His magnum opus, the four volumes on *Ajanta Frescoes*, beautifully illustrated and printed at Oxford, have already become classic, while his book, *Mandu, the City of Joy*, written at the instance of the erstwhile Dhar State, brings to light the ruins of the once flourishing capital of medieval Malwa. Nearer Hyderabad lies Muhammadabad-Bidar, the capital of the extensive Bahmani Kingdom for two hundred years, still replete with the

relics of a bygone age, and Yazdani's work, *Bidar, Its History and Monuments*, traces the topography of the city and its history, and surveys its monuments. Another highly important work is the collaborative *Early History of the Deccan*, the first of a series which Yazdani edited and to which he contributed an article on Fine Arts in Ancient Deccan, with profuse illustrations of art, sculpture and architecture of the period ending in the fall of the Kakatiyas. It might be of interest to know that the second book of the series, *History of the Deccan, Medieval Period*, is being edited by the writer of this life sketch.

The Reports of the Department of Archaeology which were regularly published by Yazdani as Director, from 1914 to 1937, show the pains he took in his survey of the archaeological and historical sites of the Nizam's Dominions which then extended from Aurangabad to Khammam and from Berar to the Tungabhadra. His description of the forts, temples, mosques, palaces as well as pre-historic sites, such as graves, cairns and cromlechs, with which these reports abound, are a testimony to the keen interest Yazdani took in his work. This was fully appreciated by H.E.H. the Nizam's Government, particularly by Sir Akbar Hydari, both when he was the Finance Minister and later when he became the Prime Minister of Hyderabad. It is a pity that Yazdani could not pay the same attention to Golkonda Fort as he did to other historical sites of the Hyderabad State.

Ghulam Yazdani succeeded Dr. Horowitz as Epigraphist to the Government of India for Persian and Arabic Inscriptions, and the volumes of *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica*, which he brought out as editor right up to 1940, are replete with photographs of Arabic and Persian epigraphs spread all over India.

It was no doubt the appreciation of Yazdani's work which made H.E.H. the Nizam's Government to allow him to visit various countries as a part of his official duty. He was deputed, along with Dr. Thomas of the India Office, to represent India at the centenary celebrations of the Société Asiatique at Paris. He made extensive tours of Europe and Western Asia to familiarise himself with different facets of Art, and visited the archaeological sites of Syria, Iraq, Arabia and Persia. While introducing him to the Secretary of the British School at Rome, Sir John Marshall mentions the countries which Yazdani had visited or proposed to visit, and says that "setting out on his journeys to Spain, Morocco, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia and Persia, Mr. Yazdani wishes to familiarise himself with the Moslem and other Oriental collections in the chief Museums of Europe...to learn all he can about the Museum administration in England, France and Germany, and to see as much of the monuments and art treasures of Europe as the time at his disposal would permit."

It was partly as a result of these studies that Yazdani, with the full backing of the Government of Hyderabad, established the State Museum

of Archaeology in a fine building constructed on the traditional Qutb Shahi style, which was formally inaugurated by H.E.H. the Nizam on 12 March 1930. When the vast collection of Nawab Salar Jung was constituted into the Salar Jung Museum, Yazdani, who had now retired from government service, was asked to act as an adviser to the museum. He worked in that capacity for less than two years, but during that short period he was able to prepare detailed lists of Celadon ware and Bidri ware, sorted out the more important Persian and Arabic manuscripts out of the vast manuscript library for display in the museum proper, listed the outstanding arms collection and deciphered the inscriptions on these weapons. He also studied the unique carpet collection in the museum and listed them according to the countries of their origin. His interest in art and archaeology was sustained, and the articles he wrote for the Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India from 1919 to 1937 may be regarded as complements to his contributions in the *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica* and the Annual Reports of the Hyderabad Archaeological Department.

Yazdani was honoured both on the academic and governmental levels. He was selected President of the Archaeological section of the Indian History Congress held at Lahore in 1940, and President of the All India Oriental Conference at its Hyderabad session in 1941. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, and an Honorary Member of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute of Bombay, while Doctorates of Literature were conferred on him by the Aligarh Muslim University and the Osmania University. When he was granted the title of O.B.E. by His Majesty's Government in 1936, Shrimati Sarojini Naidu wrote to him that "titles are conferred to honour people; but in your case the title has been honoured." In 1959 Yazdani received the title of Padmabhusan at the hands of the late Dr. Rajendra Prasad, first President of Free India.

Ghulam Yazdani was essentially a scholar and was always busy doing creative work in the lines which he had made his own. While he was in office and even after his retirement he had little time to devote to work other than various facets of archaeology and history. He did not take any part in politics, and even the State honours—his O.B.E. and his Padmabhusan—were conferred on him on the basis of his scholarship. He was not a theoretical social reformer, but judging from the education he gave to his children, both sons and daughters, it may be said that he believed in practice rather than theory. His eldest son, the late Mas'ud Yazdani specialised in the preservation and conservation of ancient records, and travelled in England, U.S.A. and other countries to study library management there. His second son 'Ali was once a member of the Hyderabad Civil Service, his eldest daughter Zubaida is an honours graduate of Oxford, the second daughter Rabi'a pursued her studies in painting and is an artist,

while his youngest daughter Tayyiba is an M.A. in History and Political Science.

A linguist of note, Yazdani had a natural flair for Oriental languages, which he studied as a hobby, and he was one of the "founding fathers" of the Urdu Majlis, a flourishing association of Hyderabad, the Persian Text Society which has published a number of important Persian books on history and literature, and the Maulana Azad Oriental Research Institute which has published original works in Persian, Urdu, Telugu and other languages. Urdu was his mother tongue, and he undertook the onerous task of compiling tracts on Archaeology in that language. He was a devout Muslim, but without the slightest prejudice against followers of other religions, and performed the pilgrimage to Mecca during one of his travels in the Middle East.

Yazdani was a man of simple habits, and though at one time he used to dress in European style he completely discarded it towards the end of his life in favour of a shairwani and a cap. He lived a simple life, and when the archaeological remains were located at remote places, without even proper roads, he would be ready to ride on ponies and use even a rickety bullock cart which would convey him to the find. With passing years he was prone to be morose, and at times it was difficult for him to control himself from giving vent to his acute feelings, especially when he suffered from a feeling of nostalgia, sadness or remorse. His house was full of books on history and archaeology, exact reproductions of a number of Ajanta frescoes, and some original paintings by modern Indian artists while even the furniture in his drawing room was of an antique nature. When he had almost reached the threshold of his grave, he would come out to greet visitors right at the steps of the beautiful artistic house he had built for himself.

Before closing this study it would be fitting to quote from a message received by the family on Ghulam Yazdani's death from Professor Humayun Kabir, the then Union Minister for Scientific and Cultural Affairs. Professor Kabir wrote: "I am deeply grieved to learn...that Padmabhusan Ghulam Yazdani Sahib has passed away.... His has been one of the most distinguished names in Indian History and Archaeology and his monumental work on the Ajanta Caves will always be remembered with gratitude."

D. D. KOSAMBI

DWIJENDRA NARAYAN JHA

(Patna University)

IN RECENT years there has been a phenomenal increase in the volume of Indian historical research, though the bulk of it follows the lines laid down either by the "leisurely and pontifical writings of the British administrators and scholars," or by the nationalist historians of pre-Independence India who were largely motivated by the ideological needs of the freedom-fighters. The influence of Western imperialist school is seen in the choice of such themes as dynastic histories isolated completely from their socio-economic milieu. The hangover of the nationalist bias is evinced in the writings of historians who are seriously preoccupied with proving that ancient India was the cradle of world-Aryan culture with colonies of its own among other peoples. These trends have gone a long way in making the waters of Indian historiography rather stagnant and turbid, only recently stirred by such researchers as try to "see India as part of Asia and the world and to explain its history in terms that are not peculiar to it alone but are of a more universal application". In this context the Marxist trend represented by the writings of the late Damodar Dharmanand Kosambi is playing a significant role in Indian historical research.

D. D. Kosambi was best known as a mathematician, but was endowed with a truly Renaissance versatility. Apart from his contribution in the field of mathematics and genetics, his editions of the poetry of Bhartrihari and of the *Subhasitaratnakosa*, the oldest known Sanskrit anthology, are landmarks in Indian text-criticism. An unrivalled collection of microliths and discovery of a remarkable number of megaliths establish his fame as a pre-historian. As a historian his contributions are great. He wrote nearly one hundred articles on different aspects of ancient Indian history and culture. The results of his historical inquiries are summed up in his two books, *Introduction to the Study of Indian History* (Bombay, 1956)[1] and *Culture and Civilisation of Ancient India In Historical Outline* (London, 1965), both of which are written in a highly effective style and seek to strike at the very roots of traditional approach to Indian history.

Generally Indian scholars have been allergic to Marxists who are held guilty of blatantly forcing the historical evidence to fit into a supposedly rigid framework laid down by Marx and Engels. Admittedly,

some historians (e.g. Dange, Hussaini) have oddly clung to the orthodox Marxist scheme of periodisation, in reaction of which there has grown up a notion that Marxism stands—and falls—for a unilinear development of history. Not all this can be said of Kosambi who admits that "Indian history does not fit precisely into this rigid framework".[2] According to him ancient Indian society, unlike the Greek and the Roman, cannot be characterised as based on slavery. Although some people were not free from earliest times to the present century, he holds that the importance of chattel slavery in the relations of production as a supply of labour for economic production was negligible.[3] The place of the slave whose surplus could be expropriated was taken by members of the sudra or lowest caste in older days. Kosambi's statement is especially true of the Vedic period when the number of slaves was very small and hence could not have engaged in productive activities like their Homeric counterparts. This is borne out by the fact that whenever the Vedic passages refer to the gift of slaves they invariably speak of women slaves made over to priests. But during the period 400-100 B.C., represented by the early Pali texts and the *Arthasastra*, slaves emerge as a factor in production. The Pali works, the oldest of which cannot be taken beyond 400 B.C., indicate that in north-eastern India slaves and hired labourers were employed in cultivation, especially in large-sized fields ranging from 500 to 1,000 karisas. This is confirmed by Kautilya who enjoins the superintendent of agriculture to requisition the services of *dasas* and *karmakaras* for working on state-farms. Though slaves participated in the productive activities of the community, it is not possible to find out their numerical strength in the absence of which it is difficult to qualify to any significant degree Kosambi's statement cited above. Nevertheless, certain basic problems remain to be examined. For example, what precisely was the relation between sudras and slaves? Again, how did the two producing classes, sudras and slaves, stand in relation to their masters? Unless these questions are adequately answered Kosambi's total denial of the existence of slavery in ancient India may not be acceptable. However, he does not show any procrustean adherence to slavery-feudalism-capitalism scheme. Slavery, he tells us, did not precede feudalism in Brazil, whereas it came in the USA, without any feudalism at all, with the bourgeoisie for the development of cotton plantations.[4]

Nor does Kosambi seem to accept the concept of Asiatic mode of production unreservedly. Although never clearly defined by Marx and hence put to a highly tendentious use by Western scholars (e.g. Karl Wittfogel), there runs through his idea of Asiatic system of production the concept of a society characterised by tribal communal ownership of land and a self-sustaining economy based on a "combination of manufacture and agriculture within the small community...." Connected with this is the notion of both Marx and Engels about the slow-moving character of the

Oriental society, as can be inferred by the former's prominent reference to its "stagnatory and vegetative life" and the latter's remarks on its "tremendous staying power." Kosambi departs from the orthodox Marxist notion of "the unchangeableness of Asiatic societies". After all, the very formation of the village economy with the plough used on a fixed plot of land implies a tremendous advance in the means of production.[5] Self-sufficiency, which, according to the founders of Marxism, is the characteristic feature of Asiatic societies, is not possible in the strict sense of the term. For, we are told, most of the Indian villages produce neither salt nor metals, the two essentials that had to be obtained by exchange. Nevertheless, it does remain true, according to Kosambi, that the Indian village became nearly self-contained from the Gupta period onwards owing mainly to the decline of trade and urban life. This led to the break-up of the guilds of merchants and artisans who migrated to the villages to eke out a living by catering to the needs of the rural population. Though Kosambi accepts the idea of the Asiatic society or Oriental commune with some reservation, some Marxists (e.g. R. S. Sharma, Irfan Habib) are chary of associating the notion of common ownership of land with the self-sufficient village economy.

Thus there are a number of points of departure from orthodox Marxism noticeable in the writings of Kosambi. Marxism is for him not a "substitute of thinking" as some anti-Marxists often feel, but a "tool of analysis" the importance of which was realised even by Gordon Childe who interpreted the vast mass of archaeological material with its application. Kosambi has ably demonstrated beyond doubt that dialectical materialism does not make the muse of history lie on the bed of Procrustes. The adoption of Marx's thesis, he tells us, does not mean blind repetition of all his conclusions (and even less those of the official party-line Marxists) at all times.[6]

For all this Kosambi remains a Marxist. For him "history is the presentation in chronological order of successive changes in the means and relations of production."[7] Any "personal", "episodic", drum-and-trumpet history of India, he points out, "should be enjoyed as romantic fiction" or "like some Indian railway time table."[8] Therefore the more important question is not who was king or whether the given region had a king, but whether its people used a plough, light or heavy, at the time. Dynastic changes, however, may be studied in so far as they indicate powerful changes in the productive basis.[9] It is in accordance with this attitude that he treats culture as the essential ways of the life of the whole people, and does not regard it purely as a matter of intellectual and spiritual values.

The type of history Kosambi seeks to reconstruct is difficult, more so in the case of India, which has "virtually no historical records worth the name."[10] Whatever historical documents exist are overwhelmingly religious and ritualistic so that an attempt to extract history from them without

some previous knowledge of the actual structure of Indian society at the time of writing "gives either no results or the ludicrous conclusions that may be read in most histories of India."[11] Such knowledge is possible only through archaeology and anthropology that guard the historian against the pitfalls which often beset a purely philological and linguistic approach.[12] Archaeology helps documents to tell us how the people of the vanished age actually lived. But here again the difficulty is that Indian archaeology is not "advanced enough to solve the really important questions, not even to ask some of them."[13] Therefore increasing use has to be made of anthropological data which are available in plenty in India. This implies that Indian archaeologists will be better at their own job if they were able to pass through the purlieus of anthropology first. There is nothing new or eccentric about Kosambi's stress on the ethnographic material. That historians might profit from an acquaintance with anthropology was suggested by Professor Tawney as early as 1933 in his Inaugural Lecture at the London School of Economics. Kosambi's renewed emphasis obviously derives from the fact that anthropological material offers a detailed analysis of phenomena roughly comparable to those which the historians are endeavouring to reconstruct with a good deal less evidence. Thus the technique followed by him is the collation of written records with archaeology and the interpretation of each of these in conjunction with ethnography.[14]

Kosambi has also extended his interdisciplinary approach to the study of punch-marked coins. He has examined nearly 1,200 coins and proceeding on the assumption that every coin bears the signature of its society ascribes them to the rulers of Magadha and Kosala.[15] He establishes a link between the king-lists in the Pali Buddhist works on the one hand and the marks on the punch-marked coins on the other.[16] The method adopted is the statistical application of mathematics to the study of coins. In spite of the weaknesses from which Kosambi's method may suffer, he has opened up a strikingly new and original line of enquiry for future numismatists of India.

Although it is not possible to discuss all his formulations within the space of a short paper, it is worthwhile to review some of Kosambi's basic ideas about the different periods of ancient Indian history. It is in consonance with his preference for anthropological data that he brings into relief certain aspects of primitive pre-class society in India. The capital fact of ancient Indian history is the continuous process of the fusion of tribal elements into the general society;[17] and therefore he underlines the process of mutual acculturation between the food-producing advanced immigrants and the food-gathering aboriginals. An important feature of Indian prehistory is that "food gathering apart from hunting and fishing remained much easier over most of India and had a far greater range

than in Europe or elsewhere in the Eurasian continent. . .even a region of average fertility like Maharashtra has over forty kinds of indigenous staples, most of which are cultivated but can also be found wild."[18] Perhaps for this reason food gatherers have lived side by side with food producers, with resultant influences of the one on the other and *vice versa*. Kosambi culls several instances from his field work to show how some of the primitive techniques and ideas have survived in Indian life and thought to this day. His illustrations are mainly drawn from his home state of Maharashtra and need be extended to other regions by future researchers.[19]

Introducing the reader to the pre-historic civilisation of the Indus Valley, Kosambi explains why the first great urban development on the sub-continent should have taken place along a river that flows across a virtual desert.[20] The river is necessary for water and fish, an important source of food; the alluvial desert keeps the early population confined to a strip along the river, making food gathering beyond a certain stage and range impossible and thus giving stimulus to the development of a food producing economy, with a surplus necessary for the maintenance of urban centres. The world's ancient civilisations, Kosambi thinks, grew up along such rivers, perhaps because the more fertile valleys were too densely overgrown with forest or too swampy to be workable with the crude and inadequate tools available. According to him the loess corridors (with thin forest) which provided a reasonably fertile base for agriculture in the Danubian and Chinese pre-historic civilisations are as good as a surrounding alluvial desert.[21] He, however, ignores the Bronze age civilisation of Crete and the neolithic cultures of Mexico and Peru, none of which is riparian or associated with desert conditions. Although civilisation grew up along the Indus and West Asian rivers flowing through similar geophysical conditions, the remarkable continuity of urban culture in Babylonia and Egypt was missing in India. In Mesopotamia, in a smaller area, and one not more fertile than the Indus basin, there were more than half a dozen cities. As compared to this, the Indus settlements were sparse; there were only two large cities. This was so because the Indus people, unlike their West Asian counterparts, did not practise canal irrigation, nor did they have the heavy plough.[22] These reconstructions seem reasonable, but must be confirmed by future excavations before they can be finally accepted. In point of fact on several other assertions made about the Harappan civilisation, scholars may have reservations. Thus the Great Bath at Mohenjo-daro may have been a ritual tank originally connected with primitive fertility rites,[23] but one may not accept his interpretation of it as a prototype of the later sacred pond (*puskara*).[24] It may be equally difficult to agree with the contention that "internal economic distribution was administered by the great temple and its priesthood"; he equates the citadel mound by the side of the Great Bath with the temple-ziggurat structures of Mesopotamia.[25] This implies that the Harappan state was

ander who defeated the tribes of the Panjab and made pastoral life difficult in the region.

The age of the Mauryas, to which Kosambi attributes the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya, witnessed an unprecedented expansion of village-economy, because the Kautilyan state itself was "the main land clearing agency, the greatest landowner, the principal owner of heavy industry, and even the greatest producer of commodities."[34] The Mauryan government flourished on a powerful cash economy and a vast salaried bureaucracy including the developed police system for coercion. But Asoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, much softened the coercive power of the Mauryan state by introducing serious changes in the administration. This can be inferred not only from the practice of the quinquennial tours of the empire by the king and his high administrative officers but also from the fact that there came into being a "new class of plenipotentiary supervisors (*dharmamahamatras*) with control over official and special funds."[35]

During Asoka's reign the Mauryan state seems to have fallen into financial straits. For, we are told, the state monopoly of metals was gradually being lost; copper mines in Bihar had begun to reach water-level; Magadhan supply of iron fell short of total demand for it. New sources of iron had been located and developed to some extent in Andhra and Mysore, but the expansion of the Mauryan power beyond the river-valleys of the north into the less fertile Deccan was precluded by the increasing financial difficulties that faced the administration. Here much of what Kosambi tells us remains conjectural and cannot perhaps be documented. But the continued debasement of coinage, to which he has referred at several places, indicates that the Mauryan treasury was impoverished and further expansion would only strain it all the more.

In the post-Mauryan period, in the north a welter of small tribes, both foreign and indigenous, divided the hegemony among them whereas the Deccan was controlled mostly by the native dynasty of the Satavahanas. Under them the period witnessed the gradual subjection of the region to the plough—a process which, according to Kosambi, goes back to the fifth century B.C. On the other hand, the brahmana priesthood, shorn of its Vedic ritualism, imposed itself on non-Aryan tribes, thus accelerating the process of mutual acculturation and their merger into general agrarian society. Flourishing trade with the Roman empire made high commodity production possible as also the rise of a mercantile class which financed the establishment and construction of many Buddhist cave temples in western India. By the end of the Gupta period certain factors paved the way for feudalism. Overseas trade with the Western world was interrupted by the fall of the Roman empire in the third century A.D. The demand for village essentials, which had increased tremendously after the extension of village settlements, could not be met by the towns and cities. The total amount of coin in circulation, Kosambi points out, was not sufficient to

support commodity production on a scale consonant with the increased population and growth of new village settlements.[36] The main problem, therefore, was of "servicing the village to make it self-contained without commodity production and cash payments."[37] This was solved by the gradual ruralisation of artisans and craftsmen and the emergence of traditional Indian village community which fostered feudalism in India through centuries.

The ideological basis of the feudal society, Kosambi states, was provided by the doctrine of *bhakti* which runs through the *Gita*, a work according to him, of not earlier than the third century A.D.[38] The date of the *Gita*, however, is highly controversial. Sukthankar has assigned it to the second century B.C.—a contention recently strengthened by some fresh Chinese evidence brought to light by Mrs. S. Jaiswal.[39] Admittedly, it may be difficult to disagree with Kosambi when he points out the similarity between the doctrine of *bhakti* which advocated an "unflinching loyalty to a god (Krishna) whose rather questionable personal record was not allowed to stand in the way" and the feudal ideology which "links together in a powerful chain the serf and retainer to feudal lord, baron to duke to king." But if the *Gita* is placed in the last centuries before Chirst, the cult of *bhakti* expounded in it cannot reasonably be treated as an ideological basis of the personal relationship that may have subsisted in feudal times between the lord and his retainer. For, in so doing one may be guilty of presuming that the work, which, in the words of Kosambi, was unpopular enough in the beginning to lead to the compilation of the "insipid" *Anugita*, determined the material life of the people.

Although one may disagree with Kosambi's views on the *Gita*, it cannot be denied that his writings reveal a highly scientific approach to religious ideas, starting from the material plane. This is clear from what he says on the decline of Buddhism. While Brahmanism, divested of expensive Vedic rituals, strengthened its hold on the newly colonised areas and their aboriginal population, Buddhism and its vast unproductive monastic foundations served no useful purpose after the decline of trade and emergence of closed village economic units. The passing away of Buddhism was logical when it "had become a drain upon the economy instead of a stimulus."[40] Here evidently Kosambi's formulation is too simplistic, especially when judged in the context of Hindu temples. We have ample evidence to show that early medieval temples amassed fabulous wealth mainly through donations. Most of them played a significant role in the economic life of the country, especially in the South, if not by investing their accumulated wealth in trade at least by extending the area of cultivable land and thus augmenting the economic production of the adjoining areas. What however is difficult to explain in the light of his contention is that these temples have survived through centuries and attract a large number of pilgrims from distant regions of India to this day, though,

without doubt, they are a serious drain on Indian economy in that they increase the total volume of unproductive wealth and reduce the capital -investment potentiality. If Kosambi's thesis were true, all famous Hindu temples should have decayed and dwindled by now through sheer neglect.

It is not only in broad generalisations that one may differ with Kosambi; even in matters of detail there is a scope for difference of opinion. His unusual faith in the totemic origin of names and *gotras* goes to irritating lengths.[41] His statement that the Mauryas derived their name from peacock -totem[42] does not sound convincing; for it is mentioned in the list of birds killed for the royal kitchen till Asoka's time. In fact Kosambi's approach suffers from obvious limitations. Marxists generally attempt at analysis in positive terms and hence face the danger of making statements which may be sometimes erroneous, particularly in view of the limited or partial nature of the evidence. But the importance of Kosambi's interpretation cannot be minimised. His conclusions remain a set of valuable hypotheses which future researchers will do well to test in the light of data available through diversification of sources.

The writings of Kosambi give evidence of his superb mind and throw up on every page some fresh and stimulating idea. Many Indians, however, will be horrified by his attacks on their cherished dogmas, the seeds of which are sown not only through granny's tales told around a family fireplace in an informal atmosphere but also through the class-room lectures in a somewhat sophisticated manner. At one place he writes: "A modern orthodox Hindu would place beef-eating on the same level as cannibalism whereas Vedic brahmins had fattened upon a steady diet of sacrificed beef."[43] Similarly he tells us that the utility of the *Gita* derived from its peculiar fundamental defect, namely dexterity in seeming to reconcile the irreconcilable.[44] We are further told that "the *Gita* with its brilliant Sanskrit and superb inconsistency is a book that allows the reader to justify almost any action while shrugging off the consequences. The many-faceted god (Krishna) is likewise inconsistent, though all things to all men and everything to most women."[45] These are only some of the mordant assertions made by Kosambi; many more can be read in his writings which orthodox historians may characterise as subversive. He has such historians in mind when Kosambi writes: "The principal aim of history, as hitherto written, has been the presentation of great events in a chronological sequence. However, the relative importance of events rarely appears the same to the people of another time, place, civilization, class bias, so that a mere chronicle does not suffice. The course of social development, the inner causes which ultimately manifest themselves in the striking events, the driving forces which underlie great movements, have to be made clear before any work can be dignified by the name of serious history. Yet this type of analysis is not always welcome to some historiographers. They, or the people who really condition their version of history, are unwilling to face the inevitable

consequences of this procedure. For the implication is necessarily that all history can be so analysed, hence current events too; but if so, it follows that the course of events can be influenced by deliberate action, that history has hereafter to be consciously made by those that live it, not merely set down after a safe interval of time by the professional historian. This is clearly dangerous to those who would suffer by the change, usually those in power. Thus such historical writing is labelled subversive. History then remains a means of escape, a romantic pastime, a profession, or a method of inducing submissiveness; it cannot become a scientific pursuit."[46]

REFERENCES

1. This book, *Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, takes a long view of Indian history from earliest times to the imposition of British rule. It is, however, beyond the area of the present writer's competence to discuss Kosambi's formulations with regard to medieval and modern periods of Indian history.
2. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 25.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 16; *Introduction*, p. 15, n. 14. The myth of millenary stagnation of Indian society has been exploded by R. S. Sharma who marks definite stages in the development of its economic basis till the beginning of feudalism in the Gupta period.
6. *Introduction*, p. 10.
7. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 10.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
9. *Introduction*, p. 13.
10. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 9.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
12. For inadequacy of philological approach see *Introduction*, pp. 5-6.
13. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 13.
14. *Introduction*, p. 7; *Culture and Civilisation*,...For a detailed treatment of Kosambi's methodology see his article "Combined Method in Indology", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, vol. vi.
15. *Introduction*, p. 64.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 166.
17. "Study and metrology of silver punch-marked coins", *New Indian Antiquary*, iv, pp. 1-35; pp. 49-76. See also Kosambi's articles on punch-marked coins in *JBBRAS*, xxiv-xxv, pp. 33-47; xxvii, pp. 261-71. For elucidation of the statistical method see "The effect of circulation upon the weight of metallic currency", *Current Science*, xi, pp. 227-30.
18. *Introduction*, p. 86.
19. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 34.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 58; *Introduction*.

22. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 62; *Introduction*, pp. 63-64.
23. *JBBRAS*, xxvii, pp. 23-30; *Introduction*, p. 60.
24. *JAOS*, lxxvii, p. 220.
25. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 69.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 83; *Introduction*, p. 97.
27. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 83.
28. *Introduction*, p. 93. For Kosambi's detailed analysis of the caste-system see "Early Stages of the Caste System in Northern India", *JBBRAS*, xxii, pp. 33-48.
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 28.
31. *JESHO*, vi, p. 318.
32. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 1201.
33. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 123. Also see "Ancient Kosala and Magadha", *JBBRAS*, xxvii, pp. 180-213.
34. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 143; *Introduction*, pp. 206-09.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 195.
37. *Ibid.*
38. D. D. Kosambi, *Myth and Reality*, Bombay, 1962, pp. 12-41.
39. S. Jaiswal, *Origin and Development of Vaisnavism*, Delhi, 1967, Appendix.
40. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 185.
41. *Ibid.*
42. *Ibid.*
43. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
44. *Myth and Reality*, p. 17.
45. *Culture and Civilisation*, p. 114.
46. "The Study of Ancient Indian Tradition", *Indica*, The Indian Historical Research Institute Silver Jubilee Commemoration Volume, Bombay, 1953.

SIR JADUNATH SARKAR

DR. A. L. SRIVASTAVA

(Agra University)

JADUNATH was born on December 10, 1870, at the village of Karachmaria in the Rajshahi district of Bengal, now in Bangladesh. He was the third son of Rajkumar Sarkar and his wife Harisundari, both of whom were sincerely religious and much above the average in ability and character. Rajkumar had inherited a big zamindari and was a well-to-do and enlightened landlord. Jadunath, brought up in rural surroundings, was a healthy child and an exceptionally brilliant student. He received his early education at his village, next at Rajshahi and finally at Presidency College, Calcutta. He passed all his classes with credit and took double Honours in English and History in 1891, and in 1892 he passed the M. A. Examination of Calcutta University in English Literature, standing First in the First Class, securing high marks and beating all previous records in the subject. He obtained 90, 92 and 95 per cent marks in three papers,[1] and a little less in other papers. He was awarded a government scholarship for higher studies in England, but he declined the offer, and decided to work for Calcutta University's Premchand Roychand Scholarship which was considered the most coveted prize by scholars of merit. In June 1893, he was appointed a lecturer in English at Ripon College, Calcutta, and was asked to lecture to the Fourth Year class, which consisted of extremely unmanageable grown-up youths. The students took him to be a first year boy, but when he quietly entered the class and started teaching "the whole class sat mute, as if spell-bound. When they recovered from their surprise, a whisper passed around that he was no other than the intellectual prodigy, Jadunath Sarkar, the wonder and envy of the student community and the favourite pupil of Percival."[2] After three years Jadunath was appointed Professor of English at Vidyasagar College and worked there for two years. In 1897 he was awarded the coveted P.R.S. and was selected for the Provincial Educational Service in June 1898. His first appointment in that cadre was as Professor of English at Presidency College, Calcutta, where he served for one year. He was then transferred to Patna College where he served from July 1899 to June, 1901. He returned to Presidency College for six months, and was posted back at Patna College at the urgent request of its Principal, C. R. Wilson. Meanwhile, he had published his first work of research, entitled *India of Aurangzib* (1901), which established his fame as a first-rate researcher and historian. He had taught English Literature for several years, and now he was shifted to the Department of

History in Patna College. He served there up to 1917. That year his services were borrowed by Banaras Hindu University where he served as Professor of History for two years (1917-19). In 1918 he was promoted to the Indian Educational Service, and was posted as Professor of History and English Literature at Ravenshaw College, Cuttack, in July 1919. In October, 1923 he was again transferred to Patna from where he retired in 1926. He was a model of punctuality and regularity in meeting his classes. Nevertheless, his students felt sure that on the last day of his service as Professor he would not lecture to them. But Jadunath "took every class to the last minute with unperturbed composure and without any reference to his retirement...." When his farewell party was over, he returned home and heaved a sigh of relief at being free from the bondage of service. He said, "What a relief from the trouble of dressing and undressing for office from tomorrow! I felt teaching not one-tenth as exacting as the ever-present anxiety for punctual attendance and the botheration of dressing under compulsion."[3] Before retiring from professorship, he was nominated as Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University, which office he held for two years, from 1926 to 1928. He declined a second term, because Vice-Chancellorship was a hindrance to his first love—historical research. In 1929 he was conferred a Knighthood. Lady Sarkar asked: "I hear that you have become something. Is it true?" He replied in good humour: "Yes, from today people will call you Lady Sarkar."[4] Sir Jadunath Sarkar had already been honoured with the title of C.I.E. in 1926.

Jadunath Sarkar's distinctive literary achievements received ample recognition in India and in foreign countries. It is, however, amusing to note that the Indian learned societies honoured the historian some three years after the celebrated Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain had recognised his eminent services to Indian history. Then the Royal Asiatic Society of Bombay awarded him the Campbell Gold Medal in 1926, and conferred upon him an honorary fellowship. The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal also made him an honorary fellow in the same year. But three years before, in 1923, he had already been elected as an honorary member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, an honour bestowed on not more than thirty scholars in the whole world.[5] The Royal Historical Society of England also appointed him an honorary corresponding member of that Society in 1935. This Society did not have more than thirty honorary corresponding members in the world.[6] The American Historical Society of Washington also appointed him its honorary life member. It may be noted that he was in his day the only Asian scholar who was thus honoured by these learned foreign societies.

At the time of leaving the portals of the Calcutta University in 1892 Jadunath was a master of English and Sanskrit. Soon after he began preparing himself assiduously for a historian's career by acquiring a sound

knowledge of Persian and Marathi. He gradually learnt Rajasthani, Hindi, French, German and Portuguese, too. As regards Persian, he cultivated the practice of reading its *shikasht* mode of writing, for without it, it was not possible to decipher documents written in that style. He discovered and collected numerous important Persian manuscripts in India, England, France, Portugal and Germany, and had their transcripts made at a great expense from the famous European libraries and from those in Delhi, Rampur, Lahore, Hyderabad, Patna and other former centres of Islamic learning in India. The result of the close study of these original sources was his P.R.S. thesis, entitled *India of Aurangzib, Its Topography, Statistics and Roads*, published in 1901. This scholarly work had taken him nine years (1892-1901) to produce. Thereafter he wrote and published five volumes on the *History of Aurangzib*, which involved full twenty-four years' labour. Side by side with his study of Aurangzib, he worked on Maratha history and produced a remarkably good volume on *Shivaji and His Times*. He then took up the work of writing a comprehensive account of the downfall of the Mughal empire in four volumes. The last volume of this series was published in 1950. The great historian's last gift was his *Military History of India*, published in 1960, nearly one and a half years after his death. The following is a list of Sir Jadunath Sarkar's works:[7]

1. *India of Aurangzib, Its Topography, Statistics and Roads*, 1901. 2. *Economics of British India*, 1909. 3. *History of Aurangzib*, vol. I, July, 1912; vol. II, July, 1912; vol. III, July, 1916; vol. IV, 1919; vol. V, December, 1924. 4. *Anecdotes of Aurangzib and Historical Essays*, 1912. 5. *Chaitanya: His Pilgrimages and Teachings*, 1913 (Its second edition entitled *Chaitanya's Life and Teachings*, 1922). 6. *Shivaji and His Times*, 1919. 7. *Studies in Mughal India*, 1919. 8. *Mughal Administration* (in three parts—1st series, 1920; 2nd series, 1925). The combined volume was published in 1925. 9. *Later Mughals by W. Irvine*, edited and continued by Jadunath Sarkar with three chapters added by him, vols. I and II, 1922. 10. *India Through the Ages*, 1928. 11. *Short History of Aurangzib*, 1930. 12. *Bihar and Orissa during the Fall of the Mughal Empire*, 1932. 13. *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. I, 1932; vol. II, 1934; vol. III, 1938; vol. IV, 1950. 14. *Studies in Aurangzib's Reign*, 1933. 15. *Massir-i-Alamgiri*, edited and translated into English, 1949. 16. *Poona Residency Correspondence* (edited), vol. I, 1930; vol. VIII, 1945; vol. XIV, 1949. 17. *House of Shivaji*, 1940. 18. *Ain-i-Akbari* (edited), vol. III, English translation by Jarrett, 1948; vol. II, 1950. 19. *Persian Records of Maratha History*, translated into English, vol. I: *Poona Matters from Delhi*; vol. II: *Mahadaji Scindhia as Regent of Delhi*. 20. *Dacca University History of Bengal*, vol. II (edited and wrote 10½ chapters besides the bibliography). 21. *Nawabs of Bengal* (Sir William Jones Bicentenary Series, no. 1, The Asiatic Society, Calcutta). 22. *Aurangzib* (Hindi edition). 23. *Shivaji* (Hindi edition). 24. *History of Dasnami Sect*, vols. I-II—both English and Hindi. 25. *Military History of India*, 1960.

Besides the above works, almost all of which have gone into more than one edition, Jadunath Sarkar contributed four chapters to the *Cambridge History of India*, vol. IV, as many as sixty original papers to the *Modern Review*, a number to the *Bengal Past and Present*, and numerous papers to the *Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission*. He wrote some thirty-five papers on historical topics for the weekly edition of the *Hindusthan Standard* of Calcutta, and many other articles for various other journals and magazines. He contributed Forewords to not less than eleven works of other scholars.[8]

Sir Jadunath was an equally good and prolific writer in Bengali and wrote numerous articles in that language, which are too many to be enumerated in this short notice.[9]

It is not generally known that on the completion of his student career in the University, Jadunath Sarkar had a mind to carry on research in Modern Indian history and had selected the Indian Mutiny of 1857 as his subject. He had consequently collected more than a hundred printed works, most of them contemporary, on that subject. The writer of this paper was once deputed to find out a certain Marathi work on Indian Ephemeries in his library at Patna and he counted a large number of books on the Mutiny in that library. So he enquired of Sir Jadunath Sarkar, when he met him next at Darjeeling in 1934, as to why he had in his library many dozens of books on the Mutiny. The historian replied that he had once an idea of writing on the Indian Mutiny, but had realised soon after that it was not possible in the 19th century to do full justice to that topic. It was perhaps for this reason that he chose to work on the Mughal period, and selected Aurangzib as his topic.

India of Aurangzib (1901) is not a history properly so called. It is primarily an account of the physical aspect of India in the second half of the 17th century. Though based on a critical study of many contemporary authorities in Persian, the most important work on which Jadunath relied in writing that book was Rai Chhatraman's *Chahar-i-Gulshan*, written in 1759. This unpublished Persian work gives an extremely useful account of topography and other details of the Mughal provinces, and the history of religious sects in the 17th and the first half of the 18th centuries in India. After writing *India of Aurangzib* Jadunath naturally turned to the history proper of Aurangzib, the first volume of which he devoted to a very critical account of the reign of Shahjahan, and the early career of Aurangzib as prince and governor, one after another, of several provinces. The second volume gives a graphic and critical account of the war of succession and the causes of Aurangzib's success. The third deals with the early measures of the reign and gives a critical analysis of the principles and policies of Aurangzib's administration and the Islamic Church State in India. The fourth volume describes the Deccan affairs and the subjugation of the states of Bijapur and Golkonda and of the fall and tragic death of Shambhaji.

The last volume carries the story of Aurangzib's unsuccessful Maratha policy to his death and the disorder and confusion in Northern India during that emperor's twenty-five-year long absence. The book ends with the historian's summing up of Aurangzib's character and the impact of his long reign on India's fortunes.

While engaged in writing his history of Aurangzib, Jadunath was brought face to face with Shivaji, the former's most formidable adversary, and this made him study Maratha history as deeply as that of the Mughals. His *Shivaji and His Times*, published in 1919, created a stir in Maharashtra as his third volume of Aurangzib had done in Muslim circles in the country. It showed that the Maratha hero, despite his spectacular success, had failed to build a nation, and that most of his institutions were not quite original. These assertions were damaging to the reputation of the nationalist historians' theories as well as to the hero himself and caused resentment in Poona. The historian remained undisturbed and continued working on the last volume of Aurangzib and editing William Irvine's *Later Mughals*, vols. I and II, and adding three chapters on Nadir Shah's invasion to the vol. II of this work. Years before he had translated Hamid-ud-din's *Ahkam -i-Alamgiri* under the title of *Anecdotes of Aurangzib* which gives an insight into that ruler's character as no other contemporary work does, and completed his *Essays*, which consisted of ten charming essays, important among which were those on the daily life of Shah Jahan and Aurangzib.

Before undertaking his second great project, namely, the downfall of the Mughal empire, he completed three small but very valuable works, namely, the *Mughal Administration* (a pioneer work on the subject), *India Through the Ages* (a very successful erudite account describing the distinctive contributions of the Aryans, the Buddhists, the Mughals and the British to the making of Indian civilisation) and *Studies in Mughal India* which consisted of twenty-two brilliantly written essays, ten of which had already appeared in the *Historical Essays*.

The first volume of the *Fall of the Mughal Empire* commences with India after Nadir Shah's departure in 1739 and the problems before Muhammad Shah, and comes down to the end of Emperor Ahmad Shah's reign in June 1754. The second volume begins with the accession of Alamgir II (June 2, 1754) and ends with Shah Alam II's return to Delhi from his exile under the tutelage of the English East India Company, on January 6, 1771. The third volume starts with the tasks before Delhi government in 1772 and comes down to the atrocities committed by Ghulam Qadir Rohilla on Shah Alam and the Rohilla's murder on 4th March, 1789. The last volume ends with the conquest of Delhi and Agra by the British in 1803. The last chapter of the volume gives the author's reflections on the passing of the old order and the ushering in of the new age. While occupied with these monumental volumes, Jadunath yet snatched time for writing yet another work on Maratha history, namely,

the *House of Shivaji* which, being a scientific study of the personalities and documents of the 17th-century Maratha history, is invaluable for research scholars. During the same period he published his *Studies in Aurangzib's Reign* consisting of eighteen historical essays, and his English translation of the *Maasir-i-Alamgiri*.

The *Military History of India* published in 1960 after the historian's death (May 1958) is a study of the development of the art of war in India, as illustrated in some of the notable battles fought on her soil. The work begins with a significant chapter on how geography dictates strategy, and consists of twenty other chapters and two appendices.

It is worthwhile to say a word about Jadunath Sarkar's methodology of research. Before he started working on the history of Aurangzib in the last decade of the 19th century, a researcher was considered to have done well, if he could utilise one or two, and exceptionally well, if only just a few contemporary chronicles, in producing his work of research. Hardly did any scholar of Medieval Indian history think of collecting all available contemporary sources in various languages on his subject, and none knew that there was anything beyond the court chronicles in Persian. Historical letters, diaries, court bulletins, and news-letters were unknown. Jadunath was the first scholar to insist on getting all original contemporary source-material in various languages ready to hand. He did not content himself with chronicles written by court historians and other writers. He made an exhaustive search of memoirs, court bulletins and historical letters written by participators in the events of their times and sometimes by contemporary gifted observers. He collected hundreds of news-letters. particularly those in Persian, known as the *Akhbarat-i-Darbar-i-Mulla*, and letters in Marathi written by Maratha agents not only in the Deccan but in all parts of Northern India. For all this it was necessary to acquire a very good knowledge of Persian, Marathi and Rajasthani which Sir Jadunath Sarkar did at the cost of a good deal of his time and money. He did not neglect French and Portuguese and acquired historical material in the contemporary writings in those languages. A thorough search and acquisition of all contemporary material in all the languages concerned with the period of his research was, in his eyes, the first indispensable preliminary for the researcher.

Jadunath Sarkar did not take the writers of chronicles and other works of court historians or other writers and even of historical letters at their face value. He subjected the text of each contemporary work to a scientific scrutiny for ascertaining their authenticity or otherwise by making use of the modern method of textual criticism. Thus he tried to separate the wheat from the chaff, and mercilessly exposed the gossip and what he called the opium-eater's tale in Marathi *bakhars* and Rajasthani historical verse and prose compositions. From his long experience of

handling historical manuscripts, he could at once discover whether a Persian manuscript was a faked one, and which part of a particular work was based on plagiarism. Such a scrutiny for establishing the text of each manuscript beyond controversy constituted the next indispensable necessity in the eyes of Jadunath Sarkar. After this he would translate all the material into English, study it with care, and then write his conclusions.

It was Sir Jadunath Sarkar's habit not to depend entirely on written records. He would visit the historical sites connected with the subject of his study, in order to acquaint himself with their topography and terrain, and other details and see the life of the common people in all parts of India with his own eyes and have an insight into their character. With these objects in view Jadunath paid numerous visits to Maharashtra, spent months in the company of the people, inspected every fort, valley and scene of battle of the Mughal age.[10] He visited all parts of India including the places of religious importance, not as a devotee but as a scholar, keen to have insight into the religious and communal life of the people. We find in his writing a vivid description of the topography of important places connected with his studies, the scenes of battles, military manoeuvres and of guerrilla tactics of the Marathas. Sir Jadunath not only displayed meticulous care and thoroughness in the collection and study of the source material, but he showed even greater care in the testing of evidence and in trying to discover the truth in a maze of contradictory records. There was no room for hesitation or vacillation in Jadunath Sarkar's mental make-up, and there remained no doubt or confusion at the touch of his merciless logic. He did not suffer from the common human failing of consideration for country, race, religion, family and the like. His works are characterised by unity of conception, of theme and presentation, by direct and easy flowing language and a charming style so that his reader's interest hardly ever flags. He bestowed a good deal of attention and care on his style which is free from cant, verbosity, indirectness and affectation. He told the present writer once, while talking of the historian's style, that at the age of 80 he usually condensed four pages of his composition into one.

The historian Jadunath had his own conception of intelligibility and purpose in history. Although he recognised the fact that intelligibility in history is inherent in the historical process itself, yet he did not altogether brush aside the medieval idea that attributed causality in history to divine intervention. He believed in human destiny; but destiny meant to him character. For example, writing about the fate that overtook Shah Alam II (1759-1806), he says: "No man can rise above destiny as the wise of ancient days have truly said. Destiny is only another name for character, and Shah Alam's character alone was responsible for the fate that now

long decay of the age-old Muslim rule in India, and the utter failure of the last Hindu attempt at empire-building by the new-sprung Marathas... must be studied with an accuracy of details as to facts and penetrating analysis as to causes if we wish to find out the true solutions of the problems of modern India and avoid pitfalls of the past."[20]

"The light of our fathers' experience is indispensably necessary in guiding aright the steps of those who would rule the destinies of our people in the present."[21] At another place he says: "History when rightly read is a justification of Providence, the revelation of a great purpose fulfilled in time."[22] True history is an "object-lesson to the people for all ages to come."

Some of Sir Jadunath Sarkar's sentences have become almost proverbial and passed into the idiom of the language. For example, he writes: (1) "A nation's greatest enemy is within, not without"; (2) "War is the supreme test of a nation's efficiency"; (3) "Nana Fadnis saw the things of Delhi Empire through his ears"; (4) "Civil war, as a test for the survival of the fittest to rule, was barred by the British bayonets"; etc.

Dr. K. R. Qanungo is of the opinion that "he [Jadunath] has all through his works revealed himself as a 'sage, counsellor and judge'." He again says, "If Jadunath is anything today he is the stern prophet of Free India in his writings and speeches."[23]

The historian Jadunath had a host of critics, some of whom were sincere and others openly hostile. But hardly did any one think of challenging the factual background of any of his numerous writings, and none dared charge him with deliberately distorting facts, omitting those that he did not like or glossing over inconvenient ones. This was because Jadunath had never been guilty of any distortion of facts and of the mistakes of omission and commission. There have been just two or three honest points of criticism regarding facts or their interpretation, and these contend that (i) in his assessment of Aurangzib's religious policy he (Sarkar) did not take notice of that emperor's Banaras *farman*, making a grant of land to the Vishwanath temple, (ii) that his interpretation of the *jazia* is not fair, and that (iii) in the absence of decisive evidence it is unfair to say that Shivaji's murder of Afzal Khan was a 'preventive murder'. The critics were silenced when it was brought home to them that (i) Aurangzib issued the *farman* in question during the war of succession when he was keen to seek the Hindu support in capturing Shuja, and it had nothing to do with his so-called desire to patronise Hindu religious institutions; (ii) that the historian did not offer his own interpretation of the *jazia*, but only summed up the "agreed judgements" of the contemporary Muslim jurists and, therefore, it is ludicrous to attempt "to exonerate Aurangzib and Islam in the same breath"; and (iii) that Afzal Khan was guilty of gripping Shivaji and striking the first blow on the Maratha king with his belt-dagger is clearly attested by Mir Alam, the famous

overwhelmed him and his house."[11] He also believed in divine justice. Writing about the punishment given to Shah Alam's Nazir, Manzoor Ali, who assisted the ruffian Ghulam Qadir Rohilla in the latter's insulting the aged emperor, he says: "One almost feels a grim satisfaction that divine justice did not sleep over the prime cause of these princely sufferings, the arch-traitor Nazir Manzoor Ali." A fine of seven lakhs was imposed upon him and he "then was beaten, dragged into a latrine and threatened with having his mouth stuffed with excrement unless he paid it."[12] Similarly, the historian speaks of divine retribution[13] when Ghulam Qadir was captured and put to death by the orders of Mahadaji Sindhia, and when his eyes were taken out of their sockets and presented to Shah Alam. Jadunath Sarkar also believed that an invisible, inscrutable and inexorable force guides human destiny and that force too was, in his eyes, synonymous with the total effect of the human action. Very often he uses 'Fate' in the sense of divine justice or divine retribution. A few examples will make the point clear. Aurangzib's strenuous reign of fifty years was, in his view, the story of a man "battling in vain against an invisible, but inexorable fate," and, therefore, it "ends in colossal failure."[14] Describing Shivaji's escape from Agra he writes: "The credit of his escape from the claws of the faithless tyrant rests solely with him, even when we concede that in so far as not a single mishap marred it at any stage, a friendly Fate must have helped the lion-hearted man of action."[15] The historian equated fate with the effects of human action when he says: "The seeds that had been sown in the third stage of his [Aurangzib's] life, unnoticed and in ignorance of their fruits, began to sprout up in the fourth, and he had to gather their baneful harvest in the fifth and closing periods of his life."[16]

Sir Jadunath believed in inevitability in history due to the operation of certain forces of the age. That is why he wrote with regard to Aurangzib's failure that "the strongest human endeavour was baffled by the forces of the age."[17] Again, he says that "slowly but pitilessly his 'Fate' works itself out, finally defeating all his efforts, though the invisible cause of his failure lay in his character and past deeds. Slowly but with increasing clearness does the tragic plot unfold itself till Aurangzib realises the true nature of the forces arrayed against him and the real trend of affairs...and he retires to Ahamadnagar only when the first summons of death reaches him."[18] Jadunath Sarkar also believed in divine mercy. For example, describing the condition of India after Nadir Shah's departure, he says, "Heaven seems to have taken pity on the sorely afflicted people of Northern India. In the next season there was adequate and timely rainfall, the earth yielded a profuse harvest and all foodstuff became cheap and plentiful, as if to make amends for the people's recent sufferings.... Nature is not half so much the cause of a nation's misery as Man."[19]

Like other great scholars and sages, Sir Jadunath was of opinion that history had a lesson for all of us. For example, he writes: "The head-

long decay of the age-old Muslim rule in India, and the utter failure of the last Hindu attempt at empire-building by the new-sprung Marathas... must be studied with an accuracy of details as to facts and penetrating analysis as to causes if we wish to find out the true solutions of the problems of modern India and avoid pitfalls of the past."[20]

"The light of our fathers' experience is indispensably necessary in guiding aright the steps of those who would rule the destinies of our people in the present."[21] At another place he says: "History when rightly read is a justification of Providence, the revelation of a great purpose fulfilled in time."[22] True history is an "object-lesson to the people for all ages to come."

Some of Sir Jadunath Sarkar's sentences have become almost proverbial and passed into the idiom of the language. For example, he writes: (1) "A nation's greatest enemy is within, not without"; (2) "War is the supreme test of a nation's efficiency"; (3) "Nana Fadnis saw the things of Delhi Empire through his ears"; (4) "Civil war, as a test for the survival of the fittest to rule, was barred by the British bayonets"; etc.

Dr. K. R. Qanungo is of the opinion that "he [Jadunath] has all through his works revealed himself as a 'sage, counsellor and judge'." He again says, "If Jadunath is anything today he is the stern prophet of Free India in his writings and speeches."[23]

The historian Jadunath had a host of critics, some of whom were sincere and others openly hostile. But hardly did any one think of challenging the factual background of any of his numerous writings, and none dared charge him with deliberately distorting facts, omitting those that he did not like or glossing over inconvenient ones. This was because Jadunath had never been guilty of any distortion of facts and of the mistakes of omission and commission. There have been just two or three honest points of criticism regarding facts or their interpretation, and these contend that (i) in his assessment of Aurangzib's religious policy he (Sarkar) did not take notice of that emperor's Banaras *farman*, making a grant of land to the Vishwanath temple, (ii) that his interpretation of the *jazia* is not fair, and that (iii) in the absence of decisive evidence it is unfair to say that Shivaji's murder of Afzal Khan was a 'preventive murder'. The critics were silenced when it was brought home to them that (i) Aurangzib issued the *farman* in question during the war of succession when he was keen to seek the Hindu support in capturing Shuja, and it had nothing to do with his so-called desire to patronise Hindu religious institutions; (ii) that the historian did not offer his own interpretation of the *jazia*, but only summed up the "agreed judgements" of the contemporary Muslim jurists and, therefore, it is ludicrous to attempt "to exonerate Aurangzib and Islam in the same breath"; and (iii) that Afzal Khan was guilty of gripping Shivaji and striking the first blow on the Maratha king with his belt-dagger is clearly attested by Mir Alam, the famous

wazir of Nizam-ul-mulk of Ahmadnagar who was also a historian.

Apart from these few instances there has been a good deal of vague and often uninformed criticism of the historian in certain circles in Calcutta and a few other places in Bengal, in Maharashtra and at Allahabad and Aligarh. The Bengal criticism was short-lived, as it had little to do with him as a historian. It questioned his knowledge of Persian and even of English. It was due to personal reasons and to party-politics in the Calcutta University. The Maharashtra criticism was the resentment caused by his intrusion into Maratha history, his merciless exposure of the comparative unreliability of the Marathi sources like the *Bakhars* and his incisive criticism of the new-fangled theories of the patriotic school of Maratha historians. The so-called Allahabad school of medieval Indian history, torn between 'academic rectitude' and 'civic duty', blames Jadunath for not omitting offensive details of temple destruction and putting down of Hindusim by force from his works. It feels that the mere mention of such facts of history is repugnant to Muslim feelings and drives a wedge between the two communities. Aligarh which looks upon medieval Indian history as its special preserve is naturally sore with the historian for his graphic and incontrovertible details of Aurangzib's anti-Hindu policy in particular and the failure of Muslim rule in India in general, and charges him with bias against Islam and the Muslim community. This charge may be dismissed as a make-believe. Sir Jadunath's impartiality is attested to by Dr. C. C. Davis of Oxford who wrote, while reviewing his *Fall of the Mughal Empire* (vol. I), that the readers of his account of the atrocities committed by Maratha raiders in Northern India would agree that the belief held in certain quarters that Sir Jadunath was biased against the Muslim rulers of medieval India was groundless.

It is curious to note how some of these very critics of the historian treasure Sir Jadunath's appreciative words about themselves and repeat them on important occasions. Dr. Tara Chand, a great pillar of the Allahabad school of Medieval Indian history and probably the author of the theory of "civic duty" versus "academic rectitude", recalled with pleasure at the annual session of the Indian Historical Records Commission at Chandigarh in 1961 Jadunath Sarkar's remark when he was informed that the learned Doctor had been entrusted with the project of writing a history of the Freedom Movement in India. The historian was reported to have said: "It [the project] has been entrusted to competent hands." Dr. Ishwari Prasad told the writer of this article times without number that when he called on the great historian during his visit to Allahabad in 1943 or 1944 Sir Jadunath said, "Come in, Dr. Ishwari Prasad, you are a genuine scholar." Professor K. A. Nizami of Aligarh has quoted with approval Sir Jadunath's estimate of Najib-ud-daula's character as a general and strategist and as a statesman. Many such examples can be easily multiplied. But these few given above are enough to show that honest differences apart,

Jadunath's conclusions and opinions could not be lightly disregarded.

Sir Jadunath was unquestionably the greatest Indian historian of his time and one of the greatest in the world. Naturally, therefore, his powerful personality and erudite works could not fail to exert great influence on contemporary scholars and historians. There was hardly any sensitive and honest worker in the field of medieval Indian history who could remain immune from this healthy influence in some way or other, directly or indirectly. Such scholars may be divided into three groups, namely, (i) those who sought his help and guidance and came directly into personal contact with him; (ii) those who had no opportunity to meet him, but derived benefit from his numerous books of research and therefore felt indebted to him; and (iii) finally those who found fault with him and yet did not fail to be impressed by his extraordinary scholarship and unconsciously followed his example and his methodology. In short, most workers, if not all, in the field of medieval Indian history felt indebted to Sir Jadunath Sarkar, whether they had come into contact with him or not and whether they were his disciples or friends or critics. Among his direct pupils and the latter's pupils there were some privileged ones like Dr. K. R. Qanungo and the writer of this paper who lived under his roof and enjoyed his hospitality and had the supreme good luck of coming into close personal contact with the historian and receiving the benefit of his guidance. In their works is reflected the master's methodology and research technique, namely, the use of all available contemporary material in the original, meticulous care in collecting and sifting evidence and presenting their theme in direct and plain style. Then there were those—and their number was larger—who were permitted, like Professor Shri Ram Sharma, Dr. Hari Ram Gupta, Dr. S. N. Rao and others, to make use of his library at his residence and share with him afternoon tea and sometimes breakfast too, but who made their own lodging and boarding arrangements. But these too had the privilege of the master's guidance and their historical writings reveal the pattern set by Sir Jadunath Sarkar—honest and thorough research. A still larger group of workers received his help and guidance through correspondence in the form of suggesting suitable topics for research, giving an outline synopsis and supplying a list of original authorities in manuscript and print and modern works to be read. There was yet another group, the largest of all, of distant scholars who drew inspiration from the historian's published works and consciously or unconsciously imitated his historical methodology and his style and manner of presentation.

It is not known to many that a very healthy influence of Sir Jadunath on his immediate students—researchers and historians of recognised merit—was the fear that if they slackened in their effort in the cause of historical research and gave up the pursuit after taking the doctorate degree, they would lose the guru's goodwill. Hence they would continue working even after having neared or reached their retirement on account of superan-

nuation. His personal example of regular hard work, abstemious living and making full use of his time, though very difficult to be imitated, served as a living ideal for many who had the aspiration to walk in his footsteps.

Nor has his influence died with his death. It is likely to continue to exert itself for a long time to come, for Sir Jadunath became, perhaps unintentionally, the father of a new school of medieval Indian historiography in the real sense. This school is functioning without the master. The main planks on which this school stands are: (i) the necessity of a sound knowledge of all the contemporary languages of medieval India, besides Sanskrit, English, Portuguese, Dutch and French; (ii) a meticulous search and collection of all original contemporary source-material to be found in the above languages; (iii) a scientific study of this material in the original; (iv) sifting of evidence as carefully and impartially as may be humanly possible; and (v) presenting the conclusions in a sober and scholarly style. This school does not believe in sacrificing 'academic rectitude' at the altar of 'civic duty'. 'Civic duty', important though it is, comes in only in the matter of presentation of facts and interpretation in temperate and balanced language and in the avoidance of excitement and passion.

This school also believes that, like its founder, every member must be constantly on the lookout for fresh material on his special subject or period, and must revise his work or works in the light of that fresh material in the second and subsequent editions. Knowledge is not static. One must keep in constant touch with the ever-growing knowledge of one's subject.

REFERENCES

1. Sardesai, "Jadunath Sarkar as I know him" in the *Life and Letters of Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, edited by H. R. Gupta, vol. I, p. 26.
2. Dr. K. R. Qanungo, "Jadunath Sarkar" in the *Life and Letters*, vol. I, pp. 41-42.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
5. Dr. H. R. Gupta, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
7. B. N. Bose, *Ibid.*, pp. 108-09.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 110-13.
9. Jogesh Chandra Bagal, *Ibid.*, pp. 114-25.
10. Sardesai, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.
11. *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. III (First ed.), p. 446.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 455-56.
13. *Ibid.*

14. *Aurangzib*, vol. V, p. 1.
15. *Shivaji*, 5th ed., pp. 140, 150.
16. *Aurangzib*, vol. V, p. 3.
17. *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 1.
18. *Ibid.*, vol. V, p. 3.
19. *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. I, p. 3.
20. *Ibid.*, vol. I, 2nd. ed., p. iii.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Aurangzib*, vol. V, p. 495.
23. *The Life and Letters of Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, vol. I, p. 71.

SIR SHAFAAT AHMAD KHAN

DR. BISHESHWAR PRASAD

(Delhi University)

HISTORIOGRAPHY has been changing its nature from time to time. The earlier conception which influenced the writings of Gibbon, Macaulay and Froude was based on the idea that it was the function of the historian to pass judgement on the actions of the people whose story he was depicting. Every action, every incident was tested in the crucible of morality and the nineteenth-century ideals were the tests then applied. History was also made into an art, and literary flavour and rhetoric governed the style. British historiography was dominated by this school up till the third quarter of the last century. Meanwhile, in Germany, a new pattern was emerging. The prevalent idea there was that the historian's task was to narrate the story of how it happened. It was the duty of the historian to be true to facts and their interpretation consisted mainly in relating them to cognate events. Causality was to be discovered by this process, and in this quest absolute reliance was to be placed on records, mostly official documents preserved in the archives. If the story is to be narrated in its barity, the literary vehicle has to be divested of all its embellishments. The greatest representative of this school in England was Lord Acton. He was guided by one burning enthusiasm and that was to show that history is the history of liberty, and to this end the entire historical process from ancient times was directed. It was natural for his generation to think on this pattern, for the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first few years of the twentieth century were the years of the fructification of the twin ideas of liberty and nationality, not only in Europe but in other continents as well. But this purpose did not deflect Acton from adhering passionately and with full fidelity to truth as revealed by records. Perhaps it was this quest for truth which made him delve into the archives of European states all his life, and as he failed to reach the absolute truth, he was not able to write any history. His lectures give a glimpse of his erudition and his way of looking at the events.

Acton founded a school of history which, in many aspects, was akin to the German school. Perhaps his true follower was his pupil and disciple Gooch. However, in British Universities at the beginning of this century, Acton's ideas of historiography held the field, and all young historians were earnestly engaged in the search for records and in analysing them. It was in this period that Shafaat Ahmad Khan went to England for higher studies and, as a young scholar of history, was brought under the

prevailing influence. In his writings is reflected the contemporary tendency of analysing the records and describing the events as they happened. To his students later, when he had the stewardship of the Department of History at Allahabad University, he always said that they have to be truthful and faithful to the records, and their analysis and interpretation were the main and primary duty of the historian.

Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan was born in a middle-class Muslim Pathan family of Moradabad in the then North-Western Provinces and Oudh. He traced his genealogy to Dundi Khan and Hafiz Rahmat Khan, the Rohilla Chiefs of the eighteenth century. After passing his high school and studying for a short while in a college in India, he went to England to pursue his studies there. Having taken his honours degree, he worked for the Doctor of Letters degree of Dublin University, which was awarded to him. He lectured for some time in the London County Council School of Education, and then returned to his native land. His first appointment was as Reader in Economics in the University of Madras, from where he moved to Allahabad, when he succeeded Rushbrook Williams, as Professor and Head of the Department of History of Allahabad University early in 1920. This institution he served till 1941, when he was appointed as the High Commissioner for India in South Africa. But during his tenure as Professor of History, in 1925 he became interested in politics, and being elected to the Provincial Legislative Council his attention was diverted to Muslim politics in a large measure. He was a member of the Round Table Conferences which he attended, and though after the institution of Provincial Autonomy under the Government of India Act of 1935, he did not remain a member of the legislature, yet his interest in politics continued unabated and that was detrimental to his career as a historian. On his return from South Africa, he remained without any definite employment for he had severed his connection with the Allahabad University. There was a considerable change in his ideas during this period and in his politics he had moved away quite far from communal or parochial and sectarian politics for which he was well known before 1940. He was then a liberal and his views were more nationalistic and verging on the Congress ideology. It was this factor which helped his selection as Minister for Education in the Interim Government formed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in 1946. He left office after a few weeks, when the Muslim League joined the Government. He was *persona non grata* with the orthodox Muslims and was a victim of communal frenzy when he was stabbed in Simla as a result of his alliance with the Congress. He survived the assault but the injury had left its mark on his health and he died not very long thereafter. Thus ended the career of the historian and politician at a relatively young age.

Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan was the author of many books, but his

chief works of historical character are the (1) *East India Trade in the 17th century*, (2) *Anglo-Portuguese Negotiations relating to Bombay 1660-1677*, (3) *Sources for the History of British India in the 17th century*, (4) *John Marshall in India*, (5) *Indian Federation*, (6) *Federal Finance*, and (7) *The History and Historians of British India*. In addition to these, his earliest publication under the title *Ideals and Realities* (1921) comprises two treatises on "English Education during the years 1689-1750" and "Indian Banking and Currency". Both these surveys have a historical tinge about them and in a sense may be considered as histories of the educational system prevalent in England in the early eighteenth century and of the exchange problem in India at the beginning of the present century. For both these works, the first of which was written when he was lecturing at the School of Education in London, and the second during his tenure as Reader in Economics in the University of Madras, are based primarily on source material published by the two Governments. The approach in both is historical. He also published a work known as *Indians in South Africa*, which is a collection of his speeches made in that country during his term of office as High Commissioner there. For our purpose we should include only the first seven books in estimating his position among Indian historians and analysing his ideas of historiography.

Dr. Khan, in all his writings, never departed from strict adherence to historicity and always based his conclusions on the source material whose authenticity he tested assiduously. His work on banking and currency was aimed at "an explanation of the principles that underlie Foreign Exchanges; and [he] applied them to the fluctuations in the exchange value of the rupee." This book was, in his words, "based mainly upon the Reports, Appendices, and Minutes of Evidence of the Herschell Commission, the Fowler Committee, the Chamberlain Commission, and the Babington Smith Committee on Indian Currency and Exchange." This source-material is the sheet-anchor of any historian of the economic conditions of that period. His later work on *Federal Finance* was similarly an attempt to examine the nature of the provisions of the Government of India Act of 1935 in so far as they concerned financial relations between the proposed, though abortive, Federation, namely, the Government of India, and the federating units, more specifically the provinces and the Indian States. In these lectures, delivered in Baroda in 1939, he relied chiefly on the official reports, proceedings of the Round Table Conferences and a host of other published material. He did not try to use his inside knowledge as a member of the Round Table Conferences and eschewed completely his views as a Muslim politician, and never even countenanced the separatist tendencies which marked the politics of Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League at the time. He favoured a strong Central Government and, while a staunch believer in the principle of federation, opposed measures which would throw the Central Government on the sweet mercies of the federating

units. He wrote, with all the vehemence so characteristic of his style: "The Central Government is the pivot round which the whole administration of India revolves, and convinced as I am of the necessity of investing the provinces of British India with substantial legislative, administrative and financial powers, and making them ultimately sovereign states of British India, I am no less convinced of the fact that Governments in general, and the Central Government in India in particular, depend for the maintenance of their existence upon credit.... Had we not ensured the safety of the Central Government, and guaranteed its solvency by investing it with sufficient resources, the Centre would have been left hanging in the air, liable to all gusts and storms of international crises and financial dislocations. The entire financial structure of India would have crashed. Stability and solvency are no less essential than security...."

We are, however, concerned here with his views of history. An early glimpse of his faith in scientific history is provided by the long introduction to his book on *Education in England.* Reviewing the writings on educational theory, he indicates his bias for historical method. Commenting on John Adam, he says: "His view of history is hazy...no light is thrown on the nature of Historical Method. The whole arrangement is based on the assumption that the history of theories is radically different from political history; that theories are not moulded by the environment; and that the historian of educational thought need concern himself only with the ideas of the period. The position is unsound, both from the point of view of logic, and from the point of view of history." He further goes on to say that "If political history is divorced completely from educational history; if theory is conceived as an ethereal being existing from eternity, not influenced by the gusts of passion, the lust of power, the desire for advancement and the wish for splendour, then theory can be treated in this manner. *But no one will deny nowadays the necessity for the classification, and the need for the scientific examination of our materials. Our theories grow naturally out of our facts. But facts too are moulded by our ideas*...political history is as essential to the historian of educational thought, as it is useful to the student of military history." Herein is clearly revealed the principle of totality of history and the supreme importance of the historical method, or scientific investigation, in other branches of knowledge.

Chronologically, the first purely historical work to be published was his collection of documents on, and discussion of, Anglo-Portuguese Negotiations relating to Bombay. In this book, and it is a republication from the *Journal of Indian History,* he narrates the course of these negotiations on the basis of contemporary official records, from which he has quoted extensively. The story is told in a forceful language and every care has been taken to make it authentic, and in conformity with the contemporary records. But, while depending on them, the author has not omitted to make a critical estimate of their value and reliability. Adverting

to the claims about the territorial extent of Bombay, the author holds that the "Company laid claim to a territory to which it was not entitled under the treaty, and the old map might have shown the absurdity of these claims." Examining the Report dated 12 February, 1776, he puts forth the view that "It is a very elaborate document, and gives a lively account of the difficulties they experienced in the prosecution of their trade. But it is unconvincing, and we are not deceived by the arguments brought forward in support of their appeal." It is in such a strain of critical appreciation and estimation that he utilises the mass of documents on the subject. His main reliance was on the papers in the Public Records office, but he did not omit to use those in the British Museum, India Office and the Bodlein. He does not appear to have had access to Portuguese papers, except those which had been used by Danvers and were kept in the India Office. This account is mainly narrational, but on occasions he has not hesitated to interpret the course of events. At one place the author has penetrated the outer shell of facts and official proceedings and discerned the basic character of the transaction. He writes: "It is amusing to read the tedious, frivolous and wearisome correspondence between the Portuguese Governor and the English Resident, the English King and the Portuguese Monarch. The negotiations are of great importance to the student, for they reveal to us in a flash the essential economic character of the Governments of the period.... A deeper study of the institutions and constitutions of the States of this period reveals a mass of tendencies converging upon a central point that is remarkable. Commercial, industrial and colonial considerations dictate, here as elsewhere, the policy of the State, and Charles' Government advocates the cause of the Company with a vigour, energy, persistence and decision that recall the direct, forcible methods of the Protectorate." But in the end, the author has commented on the failure of Charles. He writes: "One of the shrewdest of men, he found himself tricked at every turn of the wheel by the subtle Portuguese."

His book on *Sources for the History of British India in the Seventeenth Century* is a critical and detailed bibliography of the history of British contact with India in the first century of their interest in this country. It is primarily a survey of source material relating to British trade and their struggles in this direction. The book does not make any pretensions about analysing the sources of the history of India as such, hence it will be futile to expect the author to shed any light on the Persian and Indian language source material for the period or on the history of the Mughals and other Indian Chiefs. Dr. Khan has given an exhaustive list of the Company's papers, contemporary journals and travellers' accounts; and to that extent it has value for the students of history. He has appraised this material on a scientific basis. Much of this material he had utilised for his Doctoral thesis, 'East India Trade in the Seventeenth Century', which, while being

his first research and literary production, brings out prominently the author's concept of history, his sense of historiography, absolute integrity and scientific method in the utilisation of source-material and his vigorous style. This book clearly reveals the influence of the Cambridge historians of the early twentieth century on him. Discussing the scope of the book the author says: "I have traced the history of the East India trade in the seventeenth century, and estimated its influence on the foreign, no less than the economic, policy of England during the period." His purpose was to find out to what extent foreign and economic policy of that country was motivated by the interests of trade with the eastern countries, and on the basis of "essential data" preserved in the record offices in England, he has revealed that story. The period covered relates to the reigns of James I and Charles I, the Cromwellian age, the years of the reign of Charles II and finally the last years of the seventeenth century up to 1702. This study relates essentially to an important phase of British history and the author has largely confined himself to the administration and policies of the East India Company in England and their action and reaction on the policies of the Government of England.

In the earlier part of this book Dr. Khan has, on the basis of contemporary source material, both official and unofficial, the despatches and pamphlets, tried to trace the development of policy from the reign of James I to that of Charles II which was directed towards greater identification of the state with the commercial activities of a chartered Company as also to a more intimate interest in the growth of trade and industry. The non-realisation of close contact between commerce and foreign policy by the first two Stuarts had the effect of slow progress in the rise of the East India Company and the injury which it suffered at the hands of the rival Dutch Company which had close support of the State. But under Cromwell there was a turn in the tide, and Charles II, for reasons of both personal and public interest, moulded his foreign policy so as to clear the path for the success of the East India Company. From its inception, the Company and its supporters had called upon the State "to exercise functions which had hitherto been left to the initiative of private merchants." At this stage the theory of Mercantilism was being developed and, according to the author, East India trade lay at its base. The merchants demand "armed support on the part of the Crown," and this leads to the "development of a naval policy." There is considerable force in the conclusion drawn by Dr. Khan that "The State is now regarded as the sole means whereby the interest of the English merchants could be maintained. Hence a totally new significance is attached to the functions that the State is called upon to perform. It now becomes a "Commercial State", imposing a series of restrictive measures against "the principal commercial rivals, planting colonies, extending commerce, and utilizing the Navy as a means whereby every one of these functions could be performed." These

changes had occurred before 1660, and "under Charles II commerce and industry became the chief ends of foreign policy," so that then the Government "acts as the spokesman of the East India Company; it urges upon the foreign powers the necessity of giving satisfaction to the demands of the Company; and finally, it threatens reprisals if the demands are not satisfied." The author develops this point further and shows how under Charles II foreign policy was "dictated by purely commercial considerations." And thereby came "the intimate connexion of Economic Theory, Economic practice, and the State."

There are two interesting observations in this book which have reference to Indian history. One is the power of the Mughals and the centralised control exercised by them which prohibited exploitation of the Indian soil for the Company's political-cum-commercial aggressiveness. The other is the able refutation, based on contemporary source material, of *the oft-repeated theory of imperialist historians that Sir Josiah Childe* was prompted by considerations of political or territorial advantage in his war with the Mughals or that he was the true founder of the conception of the British empire in India. The author has shown that all that Childe advocated was the establishment of fortified factories for the protection of trade, but even this object was nullified by the mighty arms of the Mughal Emperor. Records and realities of the situation both endorse this view. In the concluding chapter the author exhibits the importance of Indian trade in the evolution of the economic theory of the times. The advocacy of free trade by the Company was but a phase of its desire for profit at a time when English national interest was calling for severe restrictions on the import of Indian manufactures into England. From their early support of Mercantilism to their later emphasis on free trade, the advocates of the East India Company were guided pre-eminently by its interest of profit, and in the development of both these economic theories the prevailing motive was the interest of the Company, which was effectively helped by the support afforded by the Government of the land.

In this book are clearly revealed the scientific spirit which Dr. Khan advocated staunchly as the creed of the historian. He seldom departs from fidelity to contemporary records, narrates the tale of the progress of trade on the basis of statistics and interprets the events judiciously. His style, vigorous and trenchant, is characteristic of him. There is running throughout the work a strict adherence to objectivity which is the hall-mark of his historiography.

A passing reference may also be made to the work *John Marshall in India*. The author has edited the narrative of the traveller critically and indicated clearly the light which is thrown by this contemporary account on the social and economic condition of India at the close of the seventeenth century. The book is a useful contemporary source and has been edited carefully.

In 1938 Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan was invited to deliver Srimant Sayaji Rao lectures at Baroda. He chose as his theme the "History and Historians of British India", and in two lectures covered the entire range of modern history up to almost the close of the nineteenth century. It is a forceful, candid and dispassionate review of the writings of history on the rule of the British. This small book clearly brings out his conception of history and historiography. He makes his stand about history quite distinct at the outset when he writes: "I have always been a great believer in scientific history and felt that the essential task of a historian consists in the collection of material and its vigorous examination. When this task is satisfactorily discharged, he will be able to bring all the requisite qualities of dispassionate judgement and freedom from prejudice to bear on the construction of history." Thus collection of material, its analysis and its interpretation, the three main elements of historiography, have been emphasised here. It has been shown earlier that he laid great stress on fidelity to facts as revealed by records and to this end he had directed his earlier works. It is in his later works that his sense of interpretation is brought into application, though even his earlier works are not shorn of this character. All through his career as a historian, Dr. Khan was conscious of the obligations of a scientific historian and warned against passions and prejudices governing the study of history. He compared the historian to a judge. He wrote: "The historian must perform the functions of a judge, and base his conclusions on all the available documents. He has no theories and no prepossessions. He does not, of course, start with a blank mind. He has his environment, his training, his temperament and his habits as the starting-point. He cannot divest himself of his personality which is moulded by these factors. But he should try to deal with each question with an open mind, in a calm and cool spirit, immune from the war cries of the politician and the special pleadings of the partisan. His first and most important step is the collection and examination of sources. Unless this indispensable step is taken, his research will be worthless and his history will be a curious amalgam of fiction, prejudice, passion and interest. The next step is the deduction of conclusions, and formation of sound judgement on the material which has been carefully sifted and scientifically analysed. Every historical work must be permeated by scientific spirit and must be free from racial prejudice and religious intolerance. The task of a historian is sacred. He cannot and ought not to prostitute his ability, his knowledge and his experience to the gratification of an over-mastering passion, such as fanaticism or the satisfaction of personal aggrandisement and interest. If he performs his duties faithfully and paints a true picture of the history of our homeland, he will succeed in assuaging religious feelings and consolidating the forces of our unity. Indian historiography has not yet made rapid progress, as temptations to partiality and exaggeration in a country like India, with its clash of races and in-

terests, are very serious. A historian of India has to divest himself of his national and religious characteristics before he can deal scientifically with issues which have divided nations, and organised parties in armed camps. The signs of a revival in the history of our motherland are hopeful, and a genuine attempt should now be made to reconstruct it on scientific lines." I apologise for this long extract but it clearly reveals the author's mind and view of history and the hope which he expressed has been realised now.

Scientific history has no place for imperial, national, sectarian or class -conscious histories. Dr. Khan, in his analysis of histories of the British Rule, ridicules the imperial school which had developed in England at the close of the nineteenth century, and which unfortunately has continued to thrive energetically in recent years. While appreciating the candid evaluations of earlier historians like Mill, Orme and others he bewails the tendency of later English historians, steeped in the tradition of "Kipling's imperialism", to conceive of their works as "purely propagandist manifestos in which the appetites, sub-conscious impulses and consuming ambitions of English heroes were disguised under vast mental construction and clever apologia." The change in attitude is attributed by the author to the fact that "Indians had begun to study the writings of British historians of India"; hence developed "a school of imperial historians" who "have emerged from their cloisters with laboured explanations, commentaries, and apologia for everything done by their heroes. They have collected and disseminated political resentments, and defended everything done by these pioneers on ground of geographical morality." In this category Dr. Khan includes the works on Clive and Warren Hastings which were aimed at presenting the former as "an embodiment of perfection" and "the canonisation" of the latter. He says: "the new school of imperialism paints Hastings' character in colours so strong and vivid that it is difficult to recognise his likeness." Reviewing the works on Hastings and his actions objectively, bestowing praise for his administrative measures and powers of organisation while condemning his questionable transactions, such as those affecting Nand Kumar, the Begums of Oudh and the Rohillas, Dr. Khan comes to the conclusion that "the time has now arrived when an impartial estimate of Hastings' character should be attempted by Indian historians." He does not either support "Macaulay's passionate indictment" or "the perennial stream of laudatory works" which have "flooded the market." About the latter category he says: "Many works have been composed by historians, who are more distinguished for their enthusiasm than for the knowledge of the period, and the scientific study of history has been lost sight of in the eager pursuit of hero worship."

The eighteenth century of Indian history has aroused passions, and unfortunately many modern historians have, in their enthusiasm for the

justification of Englishmen, glossed over truth and produced propagandist material. Their criterion of judgement was imperial interest. But Dr. Khan has prescribed a different approach for Indian historians. According to him, "Indian historians must change their technique and look at the revolution in Bengal from the point of view of its effect on the prosperity of the province. The criterion which we should adopt in all such cases is the amount, variety and quality of the measures adopted by the new rulers for the amelioration of the condition of the people." And rightly he considers the changes from 1757 to 1770 as "one long story of mismanagement and ignorance." Later, judging Cornwallis, he regards his policy of excluding "Indians from all positions of trust or responsibility" as a step sowing "the seed of misunderstanding and suspicion between the two races." Also "the conquests of Wellesley and Hastings created a strong reaction against Indian customs and manners while the creation of a new aristocracy by Cornwallis, which became the governing class in the country, intensified the racial cleavage between the rulers and the ruled." About Wellesley's dealings with Indian States he correctly observes that while it made British position secure in India, "if we look at the position from a higher plane, and take into account the feelings of the states which formed the network of treaties, the problem wears a different aspect." In the author's lifetime little work had been done on the early nineteenth century, hence he commends this period for intensive research, as "it offers great scope and opportunity to the student, as the material has not been properly tapped." Unfortunately, the hiatus remains there to be filled by younger historians.

Dr. Khan surveyed the main developments and trends in the post-1860 period with an objectivity based on the criterion that the state exists for the good of the people, and observed that "the Government during this period was essentially of the type called by the Germans the police state." But *pari passu* with this character of British rule and the mounting aloofness of British Civil Servants from the people, and particularly the intelligentsia, which was "saturated with the traditions of the West and not only ignorant of their national culture and historical movements but contemptuous of its influence and indifferent to its claims," there grew a mighty movement of industrial growth, progress of Indian languages, emergence of reformist movements and above all the rise of Indian nationalism. So that, as he puts it, "By the end of XIXth Century India was able to march forward in a spirit of self-assurance, and was launched on her career of victory. New India is the result of numerous forces which have united in a powerful stream and have fertilised the soil of Indian administration." The history of this mighty change has to be recorded in a scientific spirit. He said: "Students of modern India are beset by many pitfalls and unless they keep certain principles clearly in view, they are liable to form a blurred and partial view of history." Em-

phasising the need for a careful study of the vast source material he cautions the scholar against "the temptation to mix up history with politics." And he added: "scientific history is impossible in an atmosphere surcharged with passion, and scholars must tread cautiously when they deal with problems which are the catchwords of political parties." The conclusion of the lecture on 'History' reveals his mind clearly, and I seek no apology to quote his words. He wrote: "History is not merely a study of the documents; it involves also deep study of sub-conscious impulses of the age. . . .Documents are essential for objective history, but the mystical qualities of a born leader cannot be deciphered from moth-eaten documents and mouldy parchments. A historian must possess not merely the technical equipment which is requisite for his work, but also broad common sense, the mental soundness and the humane instinct which give freshness and fertility to the most insignificant incident.... We need a history, not merely of the lives and thoughts of those who worked the administrative machinery, but also of the feelings and sentiments of the people who were profoundly affected by the machine. A scientific history does not mean a 'national' history of India. It means a history based strictly on materials which will illustrate the working of national mind in different spheres, and its expression in the realms of art, administration, culture and morality. Such a history of India has yet to be written. Let us hope that the new spirit of heroic endeavour and virile self-assurance which animate the country at the present time will result in the publication of a scientific history of India." And it is this sentiment which lay beneath the conception of the *Comprehensive History of India* sponsored by the Indian History Congress.

In conclusion, it may be said without hesitation that Sir Shafaat Ahmad Khan was a stern believer in scientific history with its emphasis on objectivity, judiciousness and fidelity to source material. These he practised most effectively as is evident from the many books he has left behind. He was one of the earliest "economic historians" of India, if that expression has any meaning. Most of his early writings were devoted to economic aspects at a time when even in England there were not many adherents of this aspect of history. But apart from economic history, he emphasised the importance of developing administrative history, and called upon young scholars to bestow their attention to the administrative system of the Mughals and its impact on the system developed by the British later. He equally emphasised the value of social history and the study of political movements. Dr. Khan was a firm believer in the national unity of India which he stressed in his books on Indian Federation and Federal Finance. His versatility is revealed by the range of his studies which cover many phases of the history of India and England. He was greatly influenced in his concept of history and his methodology by the school of history which was well entrenched in Great Britain at the com-

mencement of this century. His politics was completely isolated from his career as a historian and he never allowed the former to impinge on his scientific outlook and freedom from sectarian bias or parochial prejudices. A pioneer of the view of scientific, comprehensive and objective history, he has left his impress on Indian historiography.

DR. BAL KRISHNA

DR. A. G. PAWAR

(Shivaji University, Kolhapur)

DR. BAL KRISHNA was born at Multan on July 22, 1882. The drama of his early life is striking, though pathetic. The family priest prophesied that the birth of the child was a danger to the parents. The child was, therefore, abandoned and brought up by the family of a Muslim farmer for about three years. Dr. Bal Krishna spent his boyhood in struggling against poverty and would have, perhaps, ended his life as a tailor but for the insistence of his grandfather that he should be properly educated. He gave the first sign of his talents by standing first among 8,000 students in the vernacular final examination. Then he joined the Multan High School and passed on to the D. A. V. College, Lahore, from where he took his B.A. degree in History, Economics and Chemistry. Later he took the M.A. degree in History and Economics, securing the first position in those subjects and standing second in the University. His high position in the M.A. examination would have helped him to secure a good post in Government service, but he chose differently. He joined Lala Munshiram (later Swami Shraddhanand) as a worker in the Gurukul Kangri. Here he spent ten years as a Professor of Economics and Politics, as Vice-Principal, and as Principal. He was a powerful speaker and was so carried away by his self-chosen mission that he did not care much for his health. It was during one of these lecture-tours that he contacted in the winter of 1914 the dreadful disease of asthma of which he died in 1940.

In 1919 Bal Krishna went to England, and in February, 1922, was admitted to the Ph.D. degree of the London University. His thesis, *Commercial Relations Between India and England*, was highly praised and was even used as a textbook. He returned to India in March, 1922, and in May was appointed Principal of the Rajaram College, Kolhapur. He arrived at Kolhapur on May 15, 1922, and stayed there till the end of his life (October 21, 1940). The Rajaram College, Kolhapur, was one of the oldest educational institutions in Southern Maharashtra. Though established in 1880, it was in 1922 only an Arts college with 293 pupils on the roll. Dr. Bal Krishna did phenomenal work in its development so that at the time of his death it was a full-fledged Arts and Science college teaching post-graduate courses in many subjects with 920 pupils on its roll. Dr. Bal Krishna was also instrumental in developing the city of Kolhapur as an educational centre. The Law and the Teachers' Training colleges owed their existence to his initiative and efforts.

Dr. Bal Krishna was a distinguished academician. He was a Fellow of the Royal Economic Society, of the Royal Statistical Society, and of the Royal Historical Society, London; a member of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay; a member of the Economic Association, U.S.A.; and a Fellow of the University of Bombay till shortly before his death. He was appointed a member of the Historical Records Commission of the Government of India in 1925 and continued to be so till practically the end of his life. He presided over the Modern History Section of the Indian History Congress held at Allahabad in 1938.

As a representative of the All India Arya Samaj Organization he attended the World Fellowship of Faiths in Chicago in 1933-34, and toured in the U.S.A. and Europe on his way back. In the U.S.A. he gave many lectures on Hindu religion and culture.

Dr. Bal Krishna was an orator and an able teacher. He loved his students dearly and went out of his way to help them. He has left a deep impress on the educational life of the city of Kolhapur. It would seem he had something like a vision when he conceived the idea of the Shivaji University. He ardently believed in the possibility of establishing such a University at Kolhapur, and passionately pleaded in its favour. Little did he know that one day his dream would come true.

As an author, he directed his energies to different subjects including Indian religion and culture, economics, politics and history. His *magnum opus*, however, was *Shivaji the Great* on which he spent the better part of the 18 years of his life at Kolhapur. This monumental work is in four volumes and makes up a total of 1630 pages. He wrote and saw through print the concluding pages of this book during the last weeks of his illness. Indeed, it would appear that he survived to that day only to complete the great historical work he had undertaken. It is proposed here to take a detailed note of this work only, as Dr. Bal Krishna's other writings on historical subjects are of a subsidiary nature.

Dr. Bal Krishna knew that an immense literature had grown on the romantic career of Shivaji. He had, therefore, to explain why he undertook this arduous task. "My aim has been," he says in his Foreword, "to construct the history of Shivaji and his forefathers, with original materials obtained through earnest and scrupulous research cautiously sifted and impartially used." He further adds, "The archives in London, at Batavia, and the Hague, in Bombay, Goa, Pondicherry, Madras, Tanjore, Satara and Poona have been ransacked to secure every scrap of information on the life of the hero." Emphasizing the importance of the foreign material, he adds, "...I consider it necessary to turn the torch-light of foreign contemporary writings and records on the vernacular literature to pick up the grains of truth lying scatterd here and there."

The first volume of *Shivaji The Great* came out in 1932. Before it was published the *English Records On Shivaji*, volumes I and II, had been brought

out (1931), and we had also Dr. S. N. Sen's *Foreign Biographies of Shivaji*, and Mr. Rawlinson's *Source Book of Maratha History*. The new material that Dr. Bal Krishna made use of was the Dutch records from the Hague and Batavia. More than a thousand extracts directly or indirectly relating to the career of Shivaji have been reproduced in his book. As claimed by him, these are not only useful for fixing dates and giving corroborating facts, but also fill up some gaps in the life of the hero.

The scope of the work undertaken by Dr. Bal Krishna was vast. He attempted to delineate the main events in the life of Shahaji, the father of Shivaji, and deal fully with the life of Shivaji himself. The first volume of this work is devoted to Shahaji's career. The ancestry of Shivaji has been studied in great detail, particularly in the light of the Mudhol Farmans. The authenticity of these documents is very much doubted. Dr. Bal Krishna need not have relied so much on them and he could have quoted Shahaji's own letter in which he had asserted that he is a Rajpoot.[1] A Dutch letter says that Shivaji himself had made a similar remark ("Suasy replied that the Bhonsalas were descended from the Kettery Caste").[2] An English letter of 1660 described Shivaji as a Rajpoot ("Seuagy, a great Raspoote").[3]

The dramatic event of Shahaji's imprisonment (July 25, 1648 to May 16, 1649) is fully dealt with by Dr. Bal Krishna (pages 127 to 134). He has succeeded in showing that much of the drama that has been built up around this incident by the *Bakhars* is without evidence.

The life of Shivaji is full of colourful events and there are many points on which historians still differ. The very first one of these is the birth-date of the great hero. Dr. Bal Krishna accepts the new date (February, 1630) whereas Sir Jadunath Sarkar and Rao Bahadur Sardesai stick to the old date (April, 1627). As regards Shivaji's illiteracy, Dr. Bal Krishna has succeeded in showing that Shivaji could read and write.[4] One of the earliest events in the life of Shivaji was the conquest of Jawali (January 15, 1656). This incident has been magnified by some in an attempt to show that Shivaji had resorted to treachery. Dr. Bal Krishna, after fully examining the charge, exonerates him. In discussing the death of Afzal Khan at the hands of Shivaji, the author has given a full account of the incident in Part II, chapter III and again dealt with the charge of perfidy levelled against Shivaji in Part IV, chapter IV. Dr. Bal Krishna has taken the view that, as the evil intentions of Afzal Khan are clearly proved, the consequences that he suffered are but natural. Even so, the author need not have asserted that "Shivaji was justified even in treacherously murdering Afzal Khan; because everything is fair in love and war."[5] Shivaji's surprise attack on Shaista Khan (April 5, 1663) is described in the light of Shivaji's own letter.[6] This English letter of 1660 adds: "Seuagy tells his men his Permisera (Parameshwar) bid him do it."

Shivaji's raids on Surat and his relations with the English occupy a major portion of Part II of the book (264 pages out of 433) and the re-

maining pages of the volume consisting of appendices are extracts from the Dutch records bearing on the incidents already described in the book (pages 476 to 586). The importance given to the events would look disproportionate. This, however, can be explained by the fact that most of the pages are filled in by verbatim extracts from the English and Dutch records. Whatever may be our views on Shivaji's raids on Surat—and it is not difficult to concur with the justification that the author has given—it is easy to agree with him when he says, "The sack of Surat is really remarkable for the secrecy of execution, intrepidity of the invader, and the brilliant success of Shivaji's strategy."[7] The only important event narrated in Part II that remains to be taken note of is Shivaji's visit to Agra (May 12, 1666). The narration given here is now practically superseded by the Jaipur letters brought out by Sir Jadunath Sarkar in his book *The House of Shivaji*. This is one of the most dramatic events in the life of the great hero and it is really striking that the description of Shivaji's behaviour as given in the English letter on page 257 is nearly the same as given in the Jaipur letters. In this context Dr. Bal Krishna need not have mentioned the "improbable story" coming from Dow about the intercession of Princess Zeb-un-Nisa in Shivaji's favour. The two important events highlighted in Part III of the book are the coronation of Shivaji (June 6, 1674) and his Karnatak campaign (February, 1677 to April, 1678). The importance of the coronation ceremony has been described by Shivaji himself in his letter to Maloji Ghorpade. Referring to his visit to Kutub Shah of Golkonda (1677) he writes, "... Thereupon we went and saw Kutub Shah. At the time of seeing it is the court etiquette to make low obeisance and salutation. But taking into consideration the fact that we hold an umbrella on our head, Kutub Shah exempted us from low obeisance and salutation. The Badshah becoming more gracious, embraced us closely [and] he made us sit near him. Holding our hand he expressed his favour in several ways...."[8] The brilliant success of the Southern campaign could not have been more vividly described than what is done in the Bombay letter of January, 1678 which extols Shivaji's success in this campaign as "... Successe as happy Caesars in Spain: he came, saw and overcame...."[9] Shivaji's unique contribution was the establishment of a navy of his own which, at a later date, became quite a power under the Angres, the admirals of the Marathas. Shivaji's attempt to conquer Janjira ended in a failure and the whole episode has been extensively described in Part III, chapter XX.

Part IV of the book describes the civil administration, military system, financial system, the monetary policy, the judicial system, and the religious policy. The personality of Shivaji is fully described ("He was not a 'Mountain-rat' but the Lion of Maharashtra"). The charges levelled against him have been thoroughly examined in chapters II, III and IV of the volume. "My object has been," says Dr. Bal Krishna in the Foreword to this volume, "to present the positive side of the character of the founder of the Maratha

kingdom and to examine the charges levelled against his personality. The contemporary Muslim and European writers condemn him as a robber, a rebel, a monster indulging in shameless treachery, brutal cruelty, wanton destruction and merciless oppression of innocent people. They could not appreciate the noble ideals for which he was struggling. The Hindu writers, on the other hand, depict him as an incarnation of God, born to avenge the wrongs of centuries and to liberate their religion from the foreign yoke.... He was neither a robber nor a God-incarnate, but a man of flesh and blood with supreme nobility of character, marvellous genius and implicit faith in himself that he was the chosen of God to liberate his people from the Muslim domination, to revive the ancient culture, and to restore the Hindu religion to its pristine glory. He performed the miracle by founding a Hindu kingdom against overwhelming odds. His was a struggle of a pigmy with the Bijapur giants and the Mughal Titan wherein the giants were finally laid low in dust.... The life of such a unique liberator of his people, a great nation-builder and an immortal fighter for the freedom of his country must be a source of inspiration to all the readers."

Shivaji's life is necessarily a source of inspiration, and Dr. Bal Krishna has enlivened his narration by the sincerity of his feelings and enriched it with the brilliance of his wit. One, however, wishes that *Shivaji The Great* could have been more readable if it were differently planned. It is a history -cum-source book and unfortunately the source-material overshadows the historical narration. Dr. Bal Krishna is not unaware of this result. In his Foreword to Part I he says: "Since nothing is more eloquent than facts, I have given foreign documents in extenso even at the risk of over-burdening the book with details so that the reader may have the account of the events in the very words of the contemporary writers themselves." The extracts are copious and should be useful particularly to the research workers. To an ordinary reader, the method followed by the author creates baffling difficulties. Full citations of letters in the body of the book itself, from different sources, bring in not only unnecessary and conflicting information but often lead to repetitions. *Shivaji The Great* is not an ordinary book of history that an ordinary reader can easily go through from page to page. It can better be used as a source-book for the period it covers.

It is an extraordinary thing in the life of Dr. Bal Krishna that after having spent the first forty years of his life in the land of his birth (the Punjab) he should have identified himself completely with the culture and mode of life of the people of the land of his adoption (Maharashtra). It would appear that he was simply inspired by the life of Shivaji. He would not have otherwise managed to learn the Marathi language and read the voluminous material in the vernacular. The indefatigable industry and perseverance shown by Dr. Bal Krishna in carrying on his studies on Shivaji become even more vivid and impressive if we remember that he was con-

tinuously fighting against the mortal disease—asthma—with which he was afflicted throughout this period. It was a painful sight to see him struggle to get some rest and sleep after an exhaustive day's work. Still he carried on and fought bravely against the disease and completed his memorable book. Maharashtra remembers his services with gratitude.

The other major work of Dr. Bal Krishna, *Commerical Relations Between India and England,* is a comprehensive and systematic history of the rise and progress of Indo-British trade from the beginning of the 17th century to the establishment of the British power in Bengal in the middle of the 18th—a commercial traffic which the author characterises as "the most extensive...ever known in the annals of mankind." The work opens with a detailed description of the commercial, industrial and economic conditions of India at the beginning of the 17th century, and then traces the changes brought about in them by the progress of the Anglo-Oriental trade during the following one hundred and fifty years. The author next tries to construct a connected historical account of the Indo-British trade in all its essential aspects, collecting his data mainly from the published and manuscript records at the India Office, the British Museum, the Public Record Office and the Board of Customs Library in England. Dr. Bal Krishna has also given a comparative view of the English and Dutch trades with the East, as well as of their shipping, stocks and dividends from the beginning of his period up to 1760, with frequent references to the Portuguese and French commercial activities. His object here is to point out that the oriental trade of England was not inferior in value to the trade between Holland and the East Indies. In the last chapter the author presents a short but clear survey of the very intricate subject of the import duties imposed in England from time to time upon the East India goods, pointing out their consequences on the Indian trade before the foundation of the British political sovereignty in India. The entire work is written from the study of original records, and for the period from 1625 to 1679 it covers practically untraversed ground. The chapter on the history of the East India Company's shipping, with particular reference to the rates of freights, the system of hiring ships, and the rules of measuring and rating tonnage, is of great use and interest to the students of commercial history. A large mass of facts and figures, collected by the author from numerous original sources, have been given in the form of appendices in Part II of this work. On the whole, Dr. Bal Krishna's work is a lucid commentary on the genesis and growth of the British trade and power in the Indies.

Among other works of Dr. Bal Krishna mention may be made of *The Industrial Decline of India, The Vedic Psalms, The Theory of the State In Ancient India,* and *From the Counter To The Crown,* which is a study of the causes that led to the conquest of India by a commercial corporation. Dr. Bal Krishna also wrote a few works in Hindi on the principles of economics, ancient

polity, modern constitutions and the philosophy of Yajna (religious sacrifice), besides a large number of articles in different journals in both English and his mother tongue.

REFERENCES

1. *Patrasar Sangraha*, part I, p. 154.
2. *Shivaji The Great*, part III, p. 33.
3. *Ibid.*, part II, p. 54.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.
5. *Ibid.*, part IV, p. 31.
6. *Ibid.*, part II, pp. 80-81.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
8. *Ibid.*, part III, p. 282.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 253.

M. G. RANADE

DR. V. G. HATALKAR

(*University of Bombay*)

THE late Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade was born at Niphad in the Nasik district of Maharashtra on January 18, 1842, in a practically unknown, but not a poor family.[1]

Mahadev had his education at Kolhapur, first in a primary Marathi school and then in an English school till 1856. During this period, the boy did not impress much his parents or teachers as possessing any uncommon intellectual gifts. He was reserved in speech and very quiet by nature; but steadfastness and love of justice and truth were the qualities easily discernible, even in his boyhood.

In the beginning of the year 1857, Ranade came to Bombay and joined the Elphinstone High School. He now began to attract the notice of his teachers by his superior mental calibre, original turn of mind and indefatigable industry, and they could foresee the future greatness of the man.

In 1858 Ranade joined the Elphinstone College. Here he had the good fortune to study under great professors like Harkness, Howard, Hughlings and Sir Alexander Grant, who had not only earned reputation for their great learning, but were equally noted for their interest in the all-round development of their pupils. In 1859 he passed the Matriculation examination, in 1862 the B.A., in 1864 the M.A., and in 1865 the LL.B. examinations. At the B.A. Honours examination, he was awarded a Gold Medal and books of the value of Rs. 200/-, which could only be secured by a candidate who, in the opinion of the examiners, had exhibited superior attainments. During the Convocations of the B.A., M.A. and LL.B. degrees, the Governor, Sir Bartle Frere, made a special mention of Ranade and paid him glowing compliments. In 1866 the University of Bombay honoured Ranade by appointing him a Fellow (first Indian Fellow) of the University. Here ended the career of Ranade as a pupil.

Among the contemporaries of Ranade were some great names like Bhandarkar, Wagle, Pherozeshah Mehta and Dinshaw Wacha, whom he surpassed by his brilliance and learning. His teachers and friends and even his students predicted that he would rank as one of the greatest men of modern India. *The Hindu Patriot*, one of the leading Indian journals in Bengal, styled him as the Prince of the Bombay Graduates.

In 1871 Ranade passed the Advocates' examination and was appoin-

ted First Class First Grade Subordinate Judge of Poona. From that time, side by side with his official duties, he undertook the arduous task of pushing the whole nation towards progress—political, social, economic—heedless of incurring the displeasure of the Government, the public or his dearest friends. His articles and speeches which touched all aspects of life, whether in the field of politics, social reform, education, economic progress or religion, are testimony of his extraordinary activity. He dedicated all his erudition to the cause of the welfare of the whole nation in general and Maharashtra in particular. No wonder that in course of time, he came to be regarded as the uncrowned king of Maharashtra.

During this period, he rose from one post to another, until in 1893 he was honoured with the then highest coveted post for an Indian, being appointed a Judge of the High Court of Bombay.

Before Ranade became a judge, he was a College teacher, first as a Fellow, then as a Lecturer and finally as a Professor. History, along with Economics, had always been his favourite subject, both as a student and as a teacher. According to his usual habit of making a thorough study of any subject that interested him, he went through almost the entire literature then available on the subject: Macaulay, Gibbon, Buckle, Mill, Pecoke, Tocqueville, MacKintosh, Lingard, Thiers, Carlyle, Cohrille, Hume, Niebuhr, Milman, Froude, Ranke, Hallam, Clarendon, Guizot, Macfarlane, Ferishta (translation), Elphinstone, Malcolm (*History of Malwa*), Wilks (*History of Mysore*) and of course, Grant Duff. With this equipment, it is quite natural that he should undertake to write a history of the Marathas. He is said to have been in correspondence on this subject with Nilkanth Janardan Kirtane and Justice Telang. In 1891 in Poona, he prepared a scheme by which it was decided that Balaji Prabhakar Modak should write the history of the Bahmani Kingdom, Kirtane that of the Bhonsles and Shivaji and Rao Bahadur Kashinath Narayan Sane that of the Peshwas. They were to submit their material to Telang and Ranade, who after a critical examination, would prepare the final draft for publication. Unfortunately, the scheme did not materialize. The idea was, however, not given up, and Ranade and Telang decided to undertake the work themselves.

In view of their onerous duties as judges, it was impossible for either Telang or Ranade to write a comprehensive history of the Marathas. What they could do was to write essays on Maratha history. Telang wrote his "Gleanings from Maratha Chronicles" in 1892, but died the next year, and his portion of the work remained incomplete. Ranade resolved to complete the work himself. As the material on the different topics of Maratha history was ready, he placed it before the public in the form of essays. When all of them were published one by one, they appeared in the form of a book in 1900, under the title *Rise of the Maratha Power*, along with Telang's Essay on "Gleanings from Maratha Chronicles." The "Rise" was to be

followed by the "Progress",[2] and perhaps by the "Fall". Had not the cruel hand of death snatched him away from our midst on January 16, 1901, there is little doubt that Ranade would have accomplished his cherished task. The articles on "Currencies and Mints under the Maratha Rule" and "Introduction to Peshwa's Diaries", published in 1902 and 1900 respectively, were not included in the *Rise of the Maratha Power*.

The historical writings of Ranade were not confined only to Maratha history. He possessed a profound and comprehensive mind. In fact, all his articles and speeches had a historical basis: even his High Court judgements have a historical bearing. But a special mention could be made among these of his articles on "The Drain of Indian Manuscripts", published in the Quarterly Journal of the Sarvajanik Sabha, in which Ranade focused the attention of the public on the necessity of preserving the Indian (Sanskrit) Manuscripts and stopping their drain into foreign countries; on the "Rise and Decay of Female Rights", being introduction to a collection of proceedings of the Act XV of 1856 published in 1885, by Pandit Narayan Keshav Vaidya, in which he made a historical review of the female rights in a Hindu Aryan Society; on "Southern India a Hundred Years Ago", being an address before the Indian National Social Conference at Madras in 1898, in which Ranade discussed the religious trends prevailing in South India in the 18th century; on "India under the Muslims", being an address before the Conference at Lucknow in 1899, in which he spoke on the social conditions under the Muslim rule in India; and on "Vashistha and Viswamitra", being the inaugural address before the Conference at Lahore in 1900, in which Ranade elucidated the elasticity in the Indian social structure in the olden days.

We have very little material—in fact, there is only one book before us —for a critical study. But it is an epoch-making book, in that it has given us an entirely new interpretation of the history of the Marathas. Ranade's aim in writing these stray chapters on Maratha History, as stated by him in his preface, is rather to present a clear view of the salient features of the history from the Indian standpoint, to remove many misapprehensions which detract much from the moral interest and the political lessons of the story. The lessons it seeks to illustrate, he says further, are (*a*) that the rise of the Maratha power was not a mere accident due to any chance combination, but was a genuine effort on the part of a Hindu nationality, not merely to assert its independence, but to achieve what had not been attempted before by the formation of a Confederacy of States animated by a common patriotism, and (*b*) that the success it achieved was due to a general upheaval, social, religious and political, of all classes of the population.[3] Let us now discuss the book, chapter by chapter, to see how Ranade has achieved his objective.

In the first chapter entitled "The Importance of the Maratha History" Ranade first of all refers to the view, then generally held, that "there can be no particular moral significance in the story of the rise and fall of a free-booting power, which thrived on plunder and adventure, succeeded only because it was the most cunning and adventurous among all those who helped to dismember the Great Mughal Empire after the death of Aurangzeb."[4] Such a view, protests Ranade, is inconsistent with facts and renders the whole story unintelligible. He points out that free-booters and adventurers never succeed in building up empires, which last for generations and permanently alter the political map of a great continent. Shivaji and his two successors bore the brunt of the attack of the Mughal Empire then at the zenith of its splendour. For ten generations a succession of great leaders sprang up to fill the place of those who died in the struggle and the Confederacy not only outlived opposition but derived greater strength from the reverses suffered from time to time, rising phoenix-like in greater splendour from the very ashes of its apparent ruin. This tenacity, asserts Ranade, showed clearly that the underlying principles had stronger vitality than can be explained by the standard theory of adventure and free-booting, or the illustration of a sudden conflagration.[5]

Having established this point, Ranade proceeds to focus our attention on the fact that the immediate predecessors of the British rulers of India were not Muhammadans as is too often taken for granted, but they were the native rulers of the country, who had successfully thrown off the Muhammadan yoke, and among whom the first place must be assigned to the members of the Maratha Confederacy.[6] The fact that the Maratha power, taking its rise in western Maharashtra, attained imperial supremacy over the continent of India for a century, cannot but be, according to Ranade, a matter of absorbing interest to the British rulers of India.

This achievement, asserts Ranade, was not the work of one man, or of a succession of gifted men. The foundation was laid broad and deep in the hearts of the whole people. It was the upheaval of the whole population, strongly bound together by the common bonds of language, race, religion and literature, and seeking further solidarity by a common political existence. Further, this political revolution, adds Ranade, was preceded, and in fact, to some extent caused by religious and social upheaval which moved the entire population. The political leaders acted in concert with the religious leaders of the people.

In the history of the Marathas, Ranade notices another feature which was at once the strength and the weakness of the Maratha power. It is a history of confederated states. Even Shivaji was influenced in his arrangements by his national tendency. He had a council of eight ministers who were more than councillors, themselves being both civil and military leaders. Under the Peshwas, this system was developed still further by the establishment of the great camps of the Maratha captains at Indore,

Gwalior, Dhar, Dewas, Baroda and Nagpur, with the smaller camps in Bundelkhand and along the eastern and southern boundaries of the Maratha Empire. These were so many centres of power and vitality, and as long as they were animated by a common purpose and a central idea—as they continued to be so animated for nearly a century—their power was irresistible. When the idea ceased to be respected, the Confederacy proved a source of weakness rather than strength.[7]

These, according to Ranade, are the principal features in which centres the permanent moral interest of the story of the rise and fall of the Maratha power.[8]

The second chapter illustrates how the ground was prepared for the rise of the Maratha power, which Ranade does not attribute to fortuitous circumstances, but to deep-rooted causes working long before the Muhammadan conquest of the Deccan. To trace these causes he considers the question: (*a*) why the first successful attempt to throw off the Muhammadan yoke on a large scale was made in Western India, and (*b*) what were the circumstances in the nature of the country, in the habits and the institutions of the people inhabiting it, which favoured such an attempt, and rewarded it with success.

The characteristic features of the country of Maharashtra, intersected by the Sahyadri, the Satpura and the Vindhya ranges, together with their minor offshoots, afford facilities to the inhabitants, favoured by the advantages of a bracing climate, to effectively oppose the progress of invaders and to carry on a guerrilla warfare, in which they always excelled. The numerous hill-forts on the top of these ranges enabled them to defy even the regular armies of the Mughal Emperor Aurangzeb.

Next to these natural features, the history of the country has been dominated by the character of the people. The population of the tableland of Maharashtra in which the Aryans of the north and the Dravidians of the south have been mixed in due proportion, retains the good points of both without exaggerating their defects. Owing to this circumstance the religion of Maharashtra has been distinguished by its comparative freedom from intolerance, gross bigotry and deadly dissensions which mark the forms of Hinduism prevailing in the north and south of India.

The village community with the Panchayat system and the ryotwari tenure of land, are the most characteristic institutions of Maharashtra. They have given a stability and a sense of independence to the ryots which is rarely met with in other provinces.

Further, says Ranade, the sense of local autonomy and independence has been developed to an extent which prevented the country from being retained under one political control for a long time, both under the Hindu and the Muhammadan rulers. Naturally, the Muhammadan influence, as measured by the change in the habits and the language of the people, was scarcely perceptible in these hilly parts of the western country, which were

ruled by Hindu commanders of hill-forts. Ranade then explains that about the commencement of the seventeenth century, the nominal Muhammadan rulers of Golkonda, Bijapur and Ahmednagar were virtually controlled both in the civil and military departments by the Maratha statesmen and Maratha warriors, and the hill-forts near the Ghats and the country thereabout were in the hands of Maratha jagirdars, who were nominally dependent upon these Muhammadan sovereigns. Thus a slow process of national emancipation was being peacefully worked up. "He [Shivaji]," says Ranade, "did not create the Maratha power; the power had already been created, though scattered in small centres all over the country. He sought to unite it for a higher purpose, by directing it against the common danger (the Mughal invasion of the South). This was his chief merit and his chief service to the country, and in this consists his chief claim upon the grateful remembrance of his people."[9]

Thus was the ground prepared, claims Ranade, partly by nature, partly by the ancient history of the country, partly by the habits and character of the people, but chiefly by the long discipline in arms which the country had undergone under the Muhammadan rule for three hundred years.

In the third chapter, "How the Seed was Sown", Ranade examines the special features of Shivaji's character, which foreign writers of Indian history have not been able to understand.

Shivaji's mind was cast in an intensely religious mould. Shivaji felt in him, emphasizes Ranade, what religious enthusiasm alone can inspire, the feeling that he had a mission which required him to think little of his own interests and advancement. Of course, admits Ranade, Shivaji himself did not realise the full force of this enthusiasm in his earlier years, but the sense that he had a mission to achieve grew with him every day of his life.

Shivaji had also realized that the only motive power, which is strong enough to move the masses in this country, is an appeal to their religious faith. The cult of Vithoba, the traditions of Pandharpur, attracted thousands every year, and the extempore recitals or *Katha* drew thousands. This religious enlightenment was the principal point of departure from the earlier traditions of submission to brute force, and it made itself manifest in the form of a determination that Muhammadan intolerance should not again overspread the land. None felt this influence more strongly than the worshippers who placed their faith in the shrines of Bhawani at Tuljapur and Kolhapur. They caught fire, and communicated it to others through their bards, the Gondhalis or the Bhats. Shivaji, who mixed on equal terms with Tukaram, Ramdas and other religious teachers of the time, represented these new aspirations in an intensified form in his own proper person. This was one chief source of his strength and his hold on the people.

Another influence which operated on Shivaji's mind with a force not realized by his father or teacher, was the feeling that the threatened

Mughal invasion could only be adequately met by a united opposition. This was the whole end and aim of Shivaji's policy, and it explains some of his more questionable acts.

Shivaji had a magnetic power which only true leaders of men possess, and which, argues Ranade, neither bandits nor mad fanatics can ever claim. He attracted towards himself all that was hopeful and aspiring in the land, without distinction of caste, creed or colour.

Lastly, Shivaji's self-discipline was as great as his military daring. This trait of his character stands out in marked contrast to the looseness and ferocity of those times.

Ranade graphically sums up the character of Shivaji in these words: "Religious fervour, almost at white heat, bordering on the verge of self-abnegation, a daring and adventurous spirit born of confidence that a higher power than man's protected him and his work, the magnetism of superior genius, which binds men together and leads them to victory, a rare insight into the real needs of the times, and a steadfastness of purpose, which no adverse turn of fortune could conquer, a readiness and resourcefulness rarely met with either in European or Indian history, true patriotism, which was far in advance of the times and a sense of justice tempered with mercy—these were the sources of the strength that enabled Shivaji to sow the seeds of a power which accomplished in the hands of his successors all that he had planned out, and enabled his race to write a chapter in Indian history to some purpose."[10]

In the fourth chapter, "How the Seed Thrived", Ranade in a way elaborates the point he had made in the first chapter that the work of liberation was not the work of one man. It was a work in which he required co-operation. If the leading spirits of the times had not been prepared by a long and arduous discipline to co-operate with him, even Shivaji's towering genius, argues Ranade, would have failed to accomplish the great task he had undertaken. Both Indian and European writers of Maratha history have often lost sight of the fact that he only represented in a higher degree the gifts of body and mind and the aspiring ambition of the men of his times, and that success became possible to him only because the seed was watered by capable men in all ranks of life, who accepted him as their captain and leader. These were the men whose powers and counsel helped Shivaji to found the kingdom. Not one of them failed in doing his duty in the hour of danger, not one proved treacherous to his master, while many died at their posts in the hour of victory, consoled with the thought that they had done service assigned to them. These are, says Ranade, facts which redound to their credit, as well as the love Shivaji inspired in them towards his person, and the cause he laboured to promote.

His mother Jijabai was his guiding spirit in all his undertakings, animating him with enthusiasm in moments of depression and despair. The religious turn of mind and the strong faith in his mission, so

prominent in his character, Shivaji owed entirely to his mother.

Next only to Jijabai's influence must rank the part played by Dadoji Kondadev. Dadoji did much in influencing his mind for good, restraining his wild nature and subjecting him to a course of much-needed discipline.

The most celebrated among the spiritual teachers were Tukaram and Ramdas, by whose influence the national sentiment was kept up at a higher level of spirituality and devotion to public affairs than it would otherwise have attained. Ramdas became Shivaji's spiritual guide.

The fifth and the sixth chapters, "The Tree Blossoms" and "The Tree Bears Fruit", are devoted to Shivaji's achievements and acquisitions from the occupation of the fort of Torna in 1646 till his death in 1680, and are known to all students of history. However, Ranade's estimation of the Afzal Khan episode is worth noting. "The fact may well be," writes Ranade, "that where both parties are mutually suspicious of each other, each may have misjudged the most innocent motions of the other, and he who had taken the least precautions naturally suffered for his folly. The will to do mischief might have been equally operative on both sides, though one was not prepared to take full advantage of the situation as it developed itself to the same extent as the other was."[11] Ranade is as if writing his judgement in a case before him. His unbiassed and impartial judgement is noteworthy.

The ninth chapter is devoted to the "War of Independence". The crisis in Maharashtra after Sambhaji's death is well known. It would, therefore, suffice to sum up the situation in Ranade's words: "But just when their country's fortune was at its lowest ebb, and everything seemed to be lost beyond hope, these very misfortunes served to rouse a band of patriots, who had been trained in Shivaji's school, to resolve—resourceless and penniless as they were—to secure their national independence, and drive Aurangzeb's grand army back to Hindustan." "Mere free-booters and plunderers never could have obtained success in such a war against such a foe. It was a higher moral force which brought out all the virtues of the best men of the nation—daring heroism, noble endurance, administrative skill, hope which rose higher with every disappointment, faith which was never shaken, devotion to a high ideal which was independent of time, place or person, sense of brotherhood in common danger, spirit of complete self-sacrifice and mutual concession for the common good, a trust in the final success of their cause, because it was the cause of their religion. These were the virtues which enabled the patriots of this generation to accomplish the deliverance of their country from a danger which no other race in India had been able to withstand. It is as a school for teaching of these virtues and as a severe but a salutary discipline that the War of Independence will ever be regarded as constituting the most eventful period of the Maratha History."[12]

In the twelfth chapter, "Marathas in Southern India", Ranade

emphasizes the fact that while the confederate Marathas were able to attain imperial supremacy over the continent of India, the little military settlement of the Marathas in the south, i.e. Tanjore, by refusing to be a member of the confederacy, was engulfed in the wars of the Karnatak, virutally ceased to be a leading independent State in 1762, and finally suffered complete annihilation. There can be no doubt, he says, that if it had kept up its connection with the parent state, it would have played a most useful part in the several invasions of the Marathas, which took place between 1762 and 1792, and in all of which the Maratha arms prevailed. This is the lesson which the story of this little settlement is well calculated to teach; and it is a lesson which illustrates the strength and the weakness of the Maratha power—strong when confederate and unable to retain independence when the union was broken up.[13]

In all the propositions set forth by Ranade so far, we feel there need not be any ground for controversy.

In the seventh chapter, "Shivaji as a Civil Ruler", Ranade points out that a great military commander as he was, Shivaji was also a great organizer, and a builder of civil institutions, which conduced largely to the success of the movement initiated by him, and which also enabled the country to pass unscathed through the dangers which overwhelmed it shortly after his death, and helped it to assert its claims to national independence, after a twenty years' struggle with the whole power of the Mughal Empire. These civil institutions, asserts Ranade, deserve special study because they display an originality and breadth of conception which he could not have derived from the systems of governments then prevalent under Muhammadan or Hindu rule.[14]

After describing the principal features of Shivaji's government, Ranade draws our attention to the fact that the British rule in India is carried on on the same principles and adds: "As the consequence of the observance of these maxims of state policy, a handful of Englishmen have been able to govern the whole country in a way that strikes both native and foreign students of its administration as a marvellous feat of statesmanship. The wisdom of Shivaji's principles has thus been vindicated."[15]

Ranade then goes on to compare Shivaji's Ashta Pradhan Council to the Viceroy's Executive Council. The resemblance, however, is more apparent than real. The Government of India was a bureaucracy, whereas Shivaji's government, if anything, was an autocracy. His ministers had no recognized constitutional status, and it was not necessary for Shivaji to consult them, either individually or as a body. Moreover, the ministers could not function regularly as a Council, because several of them had also military duties, and were absent on distant expeditions; three of them, again, were placed in charge of the three big divisions.[16] Secondly, the institution of the Ashta Pradhan Council was not the creation of Shivaji. The various offices existed already. It is a well-known fact that Shahaji

himself gave a Peshwa, a Majumdar, a Dabeer, and a Sabnis, as assistants to the boy Shivaji when he sent the latter to Poona from Bangalore. To these offices, Shivaji later added a Sarnobat, a Sarnis, and a Waknis, and at the time of the coronation, he further added a Panditrao, and in pursuance of this general policy of substituting Sanskrit names for Persian ones, gave Sanskrit names to all the eight offices. The idea of the number *eight* can even be traced to the *Mahabharata*.

In the eighth chapter, "The Saints and Prophets of Maharashtra", Ranade deals with another feature of the history of the Marathas which, he says, has entirely escaped the observation of European writers, though it constitutes perhaps the strongest ground why the study possesses peculiar moral interest to the student of history. It was not a mere political revolution that stirred Maharashtra towards the close of the sixteenth and the commencement of the seventeenth century. The political revolution followed a religious and social upheaval which moved the entire population. At its head were saints and prophets, poets and philosophers, who sprang chiefly from the lower orders of society—tailors, potters, carpenters, gardeners, shop-keepers, barbers and even Mahars—more often than Brahmins. The political leaders acted in concert with these religious leaders of the people.

Ranade finds a curious parallel between the history of the Reformation movement in Western Europe and the struggle represented by the lives and teachings and writings of these saints and prophets who flourished about the same time in Maharashtra. Both vehemently protested against the abuses of religion, against the domination of priestly authority, against the vices of the priests, against the preference shown to rites and ceremonies over simple and pure faith and holy life, against the use of an unknown classical language, instead of the vernacular of the people, in public worship, etc. If the European reformers protested against the monastic orders and the celibacy of the clergy, the Maratha reformers condemned fasts and self-mortification, penances and pilgrimages and the austerities of the yogis.

Ranade's statement in this connection should be examined very carefully. He has said: "What Protestantism did for Western Europe in the matter of civil liberty was accomplished *on a smaller scale* in Western India."[17] From this statement, it is quite clear that Ranade was aware of the limitations of the Maratha reformation movement and therefore, the assertion that the 'Reformation in Europe opened an era of modernism in Europe, whereas the outlook of the people in India continued to be medieval in spite of the rise of the saints,'[18] is unwarranted.

Secondly, Ranade has strictly confined himself to the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. Viewed from that angle, the Pandharpur movement or the Varkari movement did certainly bring about a social upheaval in Maharashtra. The late Bal Gangadhar Tilak, another savant of Maha-

rashtra, has opined that the Pandharpur movement or the Varkari movement has a very large share in the activity of Shivaji. We cannot forget the fact, he says, that the background for Shivaji's enterprise was prepared by Dnyaneshwar and other saints of Maharashtra.[19] If we make the mistake of considering the movement from the point of view of the twentieth century, the movement, as pointed out by V. K. Rajwade, laid Maharashtra under a thraldom of slavery, or as emphasized by Prof. G. B. Sardar, it did not bring about a general revolution in the structure of the society itself, by raising a revolt against Chaturvarnya or the caste-system.[20]

In the tenth chapter, while narrating how "order was brought out of chaos" by the organizing genius of Balaji Vishwanath, Ranade seems to recognize and even bless the new arrangement of a confederacy of the great leaders, which replaced Shivaji's Ashta Pradhan Council. He says that a constitution which might work well for a small kingdom, confined within narrow limits, would not do so when the Marathas spread over the whole country from the Narmada to the Kaveri, and the leaders were holding possessions in detached places surrounded by the entire power of the Mughals, and the Ashta Pradhan arrangement naturally broke down.[21] There seems to be an apparent contradiction, as pointed by some scholars, when Ranade blames the Peshwas for ignoring the usefulness of the Raj-Mandal or Ashta Pradhan Council. "If the Peshwas had continued true to the ancient Raj-Mandal, while substituting themselves as deputies of the hereditary Rajas,... there was no reason why the great purposes served by the Raj-Mandal under Shivaji, Rajaram and Shahu, might not have been fulfilled with equal success in the times of the Brahmin ministers."[22] If we examine carefully another statement by Ranade that "the Ashta Pradhan Council was no doubt set up by Shivaji with great foresight, but it presupposed *a well ordered centralized government*,"[23] there is reason to believe that all Ranade meant by his earlier statement was that the system could not be introduced into the newly acquired territories which required a rough sort of military administration, but when these territories were settled and regulated, there was nothing in the Ashta Pradhan system of the government to prevent its application to them. These words could not apply to the Maratha administration under Shahu or the Peshwa Nanasaheb. And when Shivaji's arrangements could work from 1677 to 1689 in such distant territories acquired by him in the extreme south, why could they not work in the territories not so distant but contiguous to Maharashtra?

In the eleventh chapter on "Chauth and Sardeshmukhi", both the assertions made by Ranade are unacceptable. First of all, he mentions that the claims to Chauth and Sardeshmukhi were first formulated by the founder of the Maratha power in 1650, at the very commencement of his career.[24] This is not true. Dr. Surendranth Sen has pointed out that Chauth existed long before the rise of the Marathas to power. Some villages of the Portuguese territory of Daman used to pay Chauth to the neighbouring Koli King

of Ramnagar as a remuneration for the performance of certain duties, and the Raja of Ramnagar is in consequence called 'the Raja Chauthia' in the Portuguese records (a treaty of the year 1615). Prof. Pissurlenkar quotes a Portuguese writer, by name Antonio Bocaro, who wrote in 1634 that the Raja of Chauthia enjoyed this pension even in the pre-Portuguese times.[25]

Secondly, Ranade has compared the Chauth and Sardeshmukhi to the Subsidiary System of Wellesley.[26] The only point of resemblance between the two is that the Marathas in the one case and the British in the other were able to maintain an army at the expense of other States. But the British system was far more regular and methodical than its Maratha counterpart. The British really gave effective protection while the Marathas did not. Dr. Surendranath Sen points out that Chauth carried with it no promise of protection in the time of Shivaji, Sambhaji and Rajaram; it was Shahu who undertook that obligation.[27]

In the two chapters, now included in the new edition, on "Introduction to the Peshwas' Diaries" and on "Currencies and Mints under Maratha Rule", there is a departure in that the material here is drawn from original sources, in the strictest sense of the word. In the former paper, Ranade once again pinpoints our attention on his main thesis that the Bakhars and the works written by English historians including Grant Duff content themselves chiefly with the narration of political events and throw little or no light upon the condition of the people, how they lived or thrived, the pleasures which amused them, their superstitions and their beliefs, their morals, their manners and customs. These historians do not also give a clear account of the way in which the work of the Government was carried on under native rule under all its heads—land-revenue, sayer revenues (consisting of Mohtūrfa, Abkari, Salt, Customs, and tributes, etc.), public debt, civil and criminal justice, police, post, mint, prisons, charities, pensions, public works, medical relief and sanitation, trade and commerce and learning. In all these respects, says Ranade, these State Diaries shed a flood of light, and far outweigh in value the narratives of wars and conquests, dynastic changes, and revolutions, which take so much space in our ordinary history.

While introducing this vast record to the students of Maratha history, Ranade points out that the later Peshwas departed from the principles laid down by Shivaji and pursued with more or less fidelity by Rajaram and Shahu, and returned to the old Brahminic ideals of exclusiveness and division, thus sowing the seeds of decay, which ultimately hastened the downfall of the Confederacy. While most of the great military commanders in the earlier period were Marathas, the men who rose to distinction in the latter half of the century were, for the most part, Brahmins. Even Prabhu element ceased to be of any importance at the Poona Court. This infusion of the racial and caste element among the

military leaders of the nation was the most distinguishing mark of the latter half of the century. There were parties within parties, says Ranade, with little chance of a common and active sympathy throughout all the classes, who had been held together with such successful results by Shivaji, Rajaram and Shahu. The Dakshina charity, started with a view to encouraging learning, became a grant generally to all Brahmins, and Poona became the centre of a large pauper population. In the hands of the last Peshwa Bajirao, the state ceased to be the ideal protector of all classes, and upholder of equal justice. It appeared that the state had no higher function than to protect the cow and the Brahmin, and the usual consequence followed such a decadence of virtue.

The next point of departure relates to the army. The strength of the Maratha cavalry continued to be its most distinguishing feature till about the year 1750, when contact with the French and the British armies and their successes induced the Maratha leaders to introduce regularly trained infantry battalions in their military force. The weakness of this new addition consisted in the fact that unlike the Mawales and the Shilledars, who each owned his plot of land and served the state, not as mercenaries but as militia, the soldiers in these trained battalions were mercenaries pure and simple, made up of foreign recruits of different nationalities who had to be paid fixed salaries all the year round, and only owed loyalty to the commanders who paid them their wages. There was no national element in this new force. If the innovation of employing trained battalions had been accompanied by the acquisition of the requisite knowledge of military strategy and the scientific processes in the use and manufacture of superior arms, the helplessness, which, in the absence of such knowledge, generally paralysed the native armies when their Euorpean officers left them, might have been avoided. In the meanwhile, the martial instincts of the neglected infantry and cavalry forces underwent a change for the worse, so that when General Wellesley and Lord Lake broke down the strength of the battalions opposed to them, there was no power left in the country which could resist the conquest that followed as a matter of course.

In assisting the English to put down Angre's power the Peshwas dimished the importance of their own navy for defensive purposes.

The hill-forts, which had played such a splendid role in the times of Shivaji, now appeared chiefly to serve the double purpose of state granaries and state prisons. They were neglected and allowed to go into disrepair.

But in the matter of the revenue and judicial management, the Government at Poona showed great powers of application, careful elaboration of detail, and an honest desire to administer well the charge entrusted to them. The financial condition of the state was decidedly more prosperous than the hand-to-mouth system which characterised the first half of the eighteenth century. The general impression, left on one's mind by the study of the revenue portion of the record in these Diaries, is on the

whole very favourable, and it will be difficult to show, says Ranade, that there has been, during the last eighty years, any decided improvement in this respect.

The proper administration of civil and criminal justice may well be regarded as a really decisive test of the efficiency and success of the native rule, claims Ranade. Judged by this test, it is to the credit of the Peshwas that, while they did not reconstitute any of the other departments of the state included in the Raj-Mandal, they revived the office of the Nyaya-dhiksha at Poona, and entrusted him with the fullest powers in disposing of civil and criminal cases which, in the last resort, came up before the Poona Court by way of appeal, or original trial, or confirmation, from the subordinate district officials. The office was filled by learned men.

The Peshwa's government also deserves credit for the inculcation of better principles and more liberal social code adopted by them. Social reform was not a subject about which the Maratha and Brahmin rulers were indifferent.

The Fowler Commission Report of 1898 was the occasion for a learned article on "Currencies and Mints under Maratha Rule". The Commission had recommended a gold standard with a gold currency for India. The recommendations of the Commission were not accepted and the Government of India introduced the Gold Exchange Standard. Ranade pointed out that in the days of the Maratha rule the people were perfectly familiar with the gold standard with a gold currency and that there was nothing unnatural about the popular demand for a gold currency in our present condition of greatly extended commercial and banking activity.

Let us first of all take note of the tribute paid to Ranade and his *Rise of the Maratha Power* in the Report of 1901 by the Director of Public Instruction for the Bombay Presidency. The report says: "Of these books, by far the most prominent is the work entitled *Rise of the Maratha Power* by late Mr. Justice Ranade. Mr. Ranade's peculiar capacity to undertake a historical work of this description will be recognized by all, and it is needless to state that the book is remarkable for its breadth of view, its concise and business-like arrangement and its sound common sense. The distinguished author has passed away from amongst us, but this book remains to show at once his mastery over the English language, his spirit of true historical research, and his fair and sympathetic treatment of a period of history which is of particular interest to a large part of the population of this Presidency."

We are therefore surprised to read what Sir Jadunath Sarkar has said about Ranade's work in the field of Indian History. Sir Jadunath says: "The older generation of Maratha scholars like Justice Ranade had put their faith in unauthentic chronicles, formal histories, and later narratives."[28] Rajwade, with an impatience and contempt which he cared not

to conceal, pointed out that original contemporary documents, or State Papers proper, were the only reliable material of history.[29] It appears that either Sir Jadunath had not read Ranade's articles on "Introduction of the Peshwas' Diaries" and "Currencies and Mints under the Maratha Rule", or that he was so blinded by his prejudice against the Bakhars or Maratha Chronicles that he completely lost sight of those two articles. Strangely enough, in the same vein, he contradicts himself when he pays an indirect compliment to Ranade. He says: "Young Parasnis worked for a long time, under the veteran M. G. Ranade's general guidance, among the Peshwas' records."[30] Sir Jadunath pays glowing tributes to the work done in Maratha history by Rajwade, Rao Bahadur Sane and D. B. Parasnis. But he forgets that all of them received inspiration and guidance from Ranade. Moreover, in his Preface, Ranade himself writes: "The manuscript notes for the second volume are nearly ready; but as, since these notes were first written, the Government of Bombay has made available [mainly through the efforts of Ranade] to the public the records in the Poona Daftar, it has been deemed advisable to delay the publication of these succeeding chapters for the present. When such fresh materials have been made available, it would not be proper to write on this part of the subject without a careful study of these hitherto -neglected sources of information."[31] In the light of these words, will it be reasonable to say that Ranade did not understand or appreciate the value of original contemporary documents or State Papers proper? In the article on "Introduction to the Peshwas' Diaries", Ranade has revolutionized our way of looking at history, and it will not be an exaggeration to say that Ranade is the Father of Maratha historiography.

Sir Jadunath's remarks are repudiated by another great historian of Bengal, Dr. Surendranath Sen, who says: "Born in Maharashtra and educated in Western method, Ranade combined in him the three qualities so indispensable for a historian of the Marathas. He knew the language and traditions of his country, was well conversant with the historical method of the West and had ready access to all papers then available. With true historical instinct he made a deliberate departure from the beaten track and selected a course of his own. His fame today does not rest on the discovery of a new document and an unknown event, but on the surer basis of the right interpretation of the history of the people."[32]

Let us sum up by saying that the *Rise of the Maratha Power* does not aim at providing fresh material on the subjec ; nor does it supply a critical apparatus for the study of the sources. It gives a Philosophy of Maratha History.

The first book to appear, after the *Rise* on Shivaji or the history of the Marathas is H. G. Rawlinson's *Shivaji the Maratha*, published in 1915. Commenting on Ranade's book, Rawlinson writes: "The late Justice

Ranade's brilliant little essay on *The Rise of the Maratha Power* is spoilt by the author's exaggerated views on his hero's merits and achievements." This is surprising, since Rawlinson himself has paid fairly glowing tributes to Shivaji in his chapter on Shivaji's character and achievements.[33]

Kincaid and Parasnis (*History of the Maratha People*, published in 1918), while offering their opinion on Ranade's work, say: "It was reserved for an Indian of modern times, M. G. Ranade, a man truly great, judged by no matter what standard, to see correctly the deep religious feeling, the many virtues, the chivalrous temper and the vast ability of the great Maratha king." This statement is sufficient to show to what extent Ranade's *Rise of the Maratha Power* influenced Kincaid's work.[34]

Sir Jadunath Sarkar (*Shivaji and His Times*, 6th edition, 1919) also accepts Ranade's interpretations. He asserts that Shivaji's system was his own creation and that he took no foreign aid in his administration,[35] but maintains that Shivaji's Karnatak campaign was undertaken for plunder and therefore not out of any policy.[36] He does not admit the comparison of Shivaji's Council to the Executive Council of the Governor-General in India. In his opinion, the solidarity of the British cabinet as well as its power was wanting in the Maratha Council of Eight Ministers.[37]

Prof. N. S. Takakhav (*The Life of Shivaji Maharaj*, published in 1921) has a grudge against Ranade because of the importance he has given to the religious revival in the shaping of the Maratha power. He writes: "Mr. Ranade's dissertation about the saints is without any foundation and does discredit to his historical research. He does not seem to have grasped the true meaning of the phrase 'Maharashtra Dharma'. He has fathered upon the saints ideas which they never even dreamt of."[38] It appears that Prof. Takakhav is looking at this question from the point of view of the twentieth century. Takakhav has also taken exception to Ranade's contention that the Maratha leaders had a long apprenticeship in the civil and military departments under Muhammadan rule. He says: "Not one among the great circle of his counsellors could have claimed an apprenticeship in Mahomedan service or boasted of a father or grandfather who had gained his laurels in the Mahomedan monarchies. Not one of his great generals had ever held a substantial jagir under the Mahomedan sovereigns."[39] This is too bold a statement to make. Moreover, the importance given to the religious movement and to the apprenticeship under Muhammadan rule does not in any way detract from the greatness of Shivaji.

S. M. Edwardes (Introduction to Grant Duff's *History of the Marathas*, 1921 edition) takes his cue from Ranade and admits that the origin of the Marathas and a brief account of Marathi literature are inseparably connected with the history of the Marathas, but comes to the conclusion that "it is doubtful whether the poetry of the saints and writers of Bhakti school ever reached, or made much impression upon the general mass of the people

of Maharashtra," and then contradicts himself by saying: "its power to mould the public mind did not survive the early days of Maratha political dominance."[40]

Dr. S. N. Sen (*Administrative System of the Marathas*, published in 1925) writes: "It is beyond doubt that Ranade was the first scholar to guide us properly to the real sources of Maratha History, as he was the first to perceive the real importance of the administrative system of Shivaji. ...Modern researches have made some of his conclusions untenable today, but the credit of pointing out a new angle of vision belongs strictly to him."[41]

Dr. Bal Krishna (*Shivaji the Great*, Part IV, 1940 edition) accepts Ranade's interpretations, except in a few minor details. He does not admit the comparison of Shivaji's Ashta Pradhan Council to the Executive Council of the Governor-General of India. However, he says that a sense of responsibility was maintained among the ministers by having their signatures on important papers and that the principles of collective and individual responsibility of the ministers to the ruler were partially recognized by the system adopted by Shivaji.[42] As regards Chauth, Dr. Bal Krishna agrees with Dr. S. N. Sen that it existed long before the rise of the Marathas to power and that it was a pension and not a tribute. Shivaji, he says, gave it a different connotation and used it on an extensive scale; for this reason, Shivaji can be called the originator and organizer of the Chauth system.[43] According to Bal Krishna the religious revival in Maharashtra really began from the seventeenth century, and became effective from about 1630 and that it gathered strength only under the inspiration and patronage of Shivaji.[44] As for the factors which contributed to the success of Shivaji, Dr. Bal Krishna maintains that these were in existence for many centuries, but that the magic power of Shivaji was needed to utilize these forces in the establishment of an independent kingdom. He cites a few more causes which in his opinion led to the success of Shivaji.[45]

Shri V. V. Joshi (*Clash of the Three Empires*, 1941) follows the lead given by Ranade and applies the same method to a wider issue, that of Indian history in the eighteenth century. In his second chapter on the Rise of the Maratha Nation, he accepts Ranade's interpretation of the factors that led to the rise of the Maratha nation.

G. S. Sardesai (*New History of the Marathas*, vol. I, 1946 edition) also accepts the point of view of Ranade. However, in his *Marathi Riyasat*, vol. I, published in 1915, Sardesai had refuted Ranade's opinion that the political revolution was preceded and caused to some extent by the religious revival.[46]

The editors of the *Oxford History of India* (3rd edition, 1958), whose anti-Indian bias is quite obvious in Book X entitled *National India*, have been kind enough to include Ranade's *Rise of the Maratha Power* as a valuable study among the authorities quoted, but state that the book

is now somewhat dated,[47] as if their assertion that "Shivaji was in the first instance a robber chieftain, who inflicted untold misery on innocent people, Hindus and Muslims alike, merely for the sake of gain, using without scruple all means to attain his ends,"[48] is up-to-date. If, in spite of the protests of Acworths, Kincaids and Rawlinsons that Shivaji's claim to greatness is not to be criticized by the ethics of the nineteenth century, the editors refuse to budge from their position, it does not redound to the credit of their historical research.

The latest book to appear on this subject is Shri. R. Y. Nadkarni's *Rise and Fall of the Maratha Empire*, published in 1966. He follows Ranade in the main, but does not agree that the saints of Maharashtra had contributed to the success of Shivaji. In Nadkarni's opinion, "the depressed material condition of the Marathas was the main cause of the rise of the Maratha State under Shivaji the Great and also of its rebirth after his death."[49] In fact, this is the angle from which he has undertaken to discuss the subject.

Although much research has been done in Maratha history since Ranade's death, his *Rise of the Maratha Power* still leads the way.

REFERENCES

1. The short life-sketch of the late Justice Ranade is taken from *Life of Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade* (in Marathi) by Prof. N. R. Phatak, 2nd edition, 1966.
2. Ranade, *Rise*, Preface, p. ii and p. 126.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. i and ii.
4. Grant Duff subscribes to this view.
5. Dr. Surendranath Sen writes: "It is very difficult to understand how an empire could last over a century and half by robbery and plunder alone, unless it had a surer and firmer basis of good government."
6. G. Duff admits this claim (*History of the Marathas*, edited by Edwardes, 1921, vol. I, p. 39).
7. We cannot agree with Ranade on this point. Shivaji has won the admiration of one and all because he persistently refused to grant inams or jagirs to any of his officers. Whereas in the Maratha Confederacy, the principle of a jagir is inherent. The confederate leaders were masters in the territories in which they had established themselves by their own resources. Shivaji would never have allowed this development. It is true that his councillors were both civil and military leaders, but they played the role of the present-day governors who received salaries from the royal treasury, and were definitely not masters of the territory which they governed.
8. In the Confederacy arrangements of the Marathas, Ranade foresaw the future possibilities of a federated India, distributed according to nationalities, and subjected to a common bond of connection with a central authority. (*Rise*, p. 8)

9. Ranade, *Rise*, p. 20.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.
11. Sir Jadunath Sarkar, to whom all the latest Marathi as well Persian original materials were available, gives the verdict in unequivocal terms on the incident: "Afzal struck the first blow and that Shivaji only committed what Burke calls 'preventive murder'—a case of diamond cut diamond." (J. N. Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times*, 6th edn., 1961, p. 74)
12. Ranade, *Rise*, pp. 95, 104.
13. As for Kolhapur, to whose sorry fate Ranade has referred in the chapter on "Chauth and Sardeshmukhi", instead of co-operating with the parent state, it created obstacles in its way from the beginning till almost the end. In regard to the other Maratha settlement at Gooty, it suffered the same fate, and for the same fault, namely, that it cut itself off from the confederacy, and tried to shift for itself. (*Rise*, p. 135)
14. Dr. Surendranath Sen says that Shivaji was not the creator of a new system. He modified and reformed what he had inherited from his Hindu-Muhammadan predecessors. Every administration has its roots in the past and the Maratha system was by no means an exception (*Administrative System*, p. 27). Sir Jadunath Sarkar asserts that Shivaji's system was his own creation and that he took no foreign aid in his administration (*Shivaji and His Times*, p. 388).
15. Ranade, *Rise*, p. 76.
16. S. N. Sen, *Administrative System*, p. 49; Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times*, p. 361.
17. Ranade, *Rise*, p. 6.
18. See Introduction, *Rise*, pp. vi-vii.
19. S. V. Bapat, *Reminiscences and Anecdotes of B. G. Tilak*.
20. Ranade, *Rise*, Introduction, pp. vi-vii.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 117.
25. Dr. S. N. Sen, *Administrative System*, p. 114; *Military System*, p. 37.
26. Ranade, *Rise*, p. 117.
27. Dr. S. N. Sen, *Military System*, p. 41; *Administrative System*, p. 115
28. It has become a fashion to denounce the Bakhars or the Maratha Chronicles outright. The student of history should be on his guard against this attitude. Have the broad facts of Maratha history described in these Chronicles been altered by the study of the original documents or the State Papers ? It is the job of the historian to find out the discrepancies. Is there any guarantee that the official paper will tell the whole truth? Two of the most eminent scholars and judges, the late Justice Ranade and the late Justice Telang, were best qualified by their profession to sift truth from the huge mass of evidence in the Chronicles. This is not at all to underestimate the value of the original documents or the State Papers.
29. J. N. Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times*, 6th edn., 1961, p. 282.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 307.
31. Ranade, *Rise*, Preface, p. ii.
32. S. N. Sen, *Administrative System*, pp. 22-23.
33. H. G. Rawlinson, *Shivaji the Maratha*, p. 9 and pp. 98-100.
34. Kincaid and Parasnis, *History of the Maratha People*, p. 110.
35. J. N. Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times*, p. 496.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 365.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 463.
38. N. S. Takakhav, *Life of Shivaji Maharaj*, p. 596, note i.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 604. However, he concedes that many officers were trained under Shahaji.

40. G. Duff, *History of the Marathas*, ed. Edwardes, pp. lxxiv-lxxv.
41. S. N. Sen, *Administrative System*, p. 23.
42. Dr. Bal Krishna, *Shivaji the Great*, Part IV, p. 61.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 130-31.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 199-201.
46. G. S. Sardesai, *Marathi Riyasat*, p. 101.
47. *Oxford History of India*, p. 491.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 415.
49. R. Y. Nadkarni, *Rise and Fall of the Maratha Empire*, p. 296.

KASHINATH TRIMBAK TELANG

DR. L. B. KENY

(University of Bombay)

KASHINATH Trimbak Telang was born on 30 August, 1850 in a middle -class Hindu family belonging to the Gaud Saraswat Brahmins. His family was one of the twelve Saraswat families that had migrated to Bombay from their native home in Goa, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, to seek their fortune. Telang's grandfather Ramachandra got there the job of an assistant at the mercantile house of Forbes and Company. Ramachandra Telang had four sons, of whom only two, Trimbak and Bapubhai, had survived. Bapubhai had two sons called Krishnarao and Kashinath. Trimbak had no issue. He, therefore, adopted Kashinath, who thenceforth styled himself as Kashinath Trimbak Telang.

Telang was sent to the Elphinstone High School to learn English, at the age of nine. It was at this time that his attention was drawn towards Marathi poetry, to appreciate which he started the study of Sanskrit in the traditional style. In fact, it was partly due to the influence of one of his early school companions, Shripat Babaji Thakur, who later enjoyed the distinction of being the first Indian Civil Servant from Bombay, that Telang got interested in Sanskrit. Both of them were among the first few students who offered Sanskrit as their second language at the Matriculation examination. When Telang left the Elphinstone School, the Principal, Mr. Jefferson, presented him with a copy of Max Müller's *History of Sanskrit Literature* as the European's appreciation of Telang's Sanskrit scholarship. Telang passed his school examination with such rapid progress and credit that within five years of his admission to the Elphinstone School he passed his Matriculation examination in 1864, at the young age of fourteen.

Telang was the most distinguished of the band of young students who joined the Elphinstone College in December, 1864. He showed there the same passion for general reading which marked him out at school. Telang's companion Ambalal Sakarlal Desai records that during the three years of his degree course, Telang read William Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Walter Scott, Edward Lytton, William Thackeray and Charles Dickens in addition to the prescribed curriculum of regular studies which by itself was quite formidable. Telang's favourite subjects at college were logic, ethics and literature. In Sanskrit he was soon to make his mark as an erudite scholar.

Telang obtained the Junior Scholarship in 1865, and later a Senior

Scholarship in English and Sanskrit in April 1866; and in the third year, in 1867, he won another Senior Scholarship. While describing Telang's performance at the F.A. examination in November 1866, Bhandarkar writes: "Question after question was put to him, and all were so satisfactorily and readily answered that the examiners awarded him the highest marks." Telang took his B.A. degree from the Bombay University in January 1868. He passed his M.A. in 1869 with Sanskrit and English, and gained the Bhagwandas Purshottamdas Scholarship by his high attainments in Sanskrit. He did his LL.B. in 1870 and became an Advocate in 1872. In 1877 the Government appointed him as a Fellow of the Bombay University. He was also a member of the Syndicate from 1882 to 1892 when he became the Vice-Chancellor of the University.

Telang was one of the seven Indians appointed as members of the Education Commission by Lord Ripon in 1882. He embodied his views in a separate Minute of Dissent, which the President of the Commission, Sir William Hunter, has declared to be a very valuable contribution to higher education. In the minute Telang insisted that higher education should partake of the characteristics of Eastern and Western cultures. He also held strong views about technical education and urged its speedy expansion. The establishment of the Victoria Jubilee Technical Institute in Bombay was truly the coping stone of all the public activities of Telang.

Excepting for the last four years, Telang's main career was that of a lawyer. In all matters of Hindu Law, particularly, Telang was the most competent interpreter at the Bombay Bar. His thorough scholarship in Sanskrit enabled him to refer with ease to the original sources. While at the Bar he displayed a great desire in bringing the law into line with modern needs and the complexities of a developing social life. In 1881 Telang became the first Indian Law Professor in Bombay.

Despite ill-health, his work as a judge, though brief, was of an outstanding character. It was said that "for the first time in the history of that great institution—the High Court—there was, while Telang sat on the Bench, no need to go outside for the ripest scholarship to interpret the ancient laws of the country and to control the interpretation of others."

Telang breathed his last in the early hours of 1st September 1893.

The Indian generation to which Telang belonged was brought up on the intellectual nourishment of the British rule. Nineteenth-century England was on a social, economic, religious, political and literary war-path. Banning of Slave Trade, Free Trade and Protection, Reform Bill, Emancipation of Women, in short, questioning the fundamentals of all problems, became the characteristics of that period. And scholars like Dr. Wilson, Prof. Patton and Prof. Haward, trained in such atmosphere, became the teachers and guides of the then young educated Indians like Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherozeshah Mehta, M. G. Ranade, R. G. Bhandarkar and K. T. Telang who all

became lovers of steady reform in all the spheres of India's national life. Acquaintance with education in European history, science and literature enabled these Indian intellectuals to abandon the absurdities of their Indian popular myths. Traditional defects and prejudices were being exposed.

Some Indians struggled to free reason from the bondage of superstition and social usage. Others devoted themselves to politics. Midway between these stood Telang as an apostle of reforms. He combined in himself the simplicity of an oriental scholar and the passion for progress and refinement of the West. He was a bridge between European thought and oriental living. By temperament he was, in the words of V. N. Naik, "rational and critical, yet deep and reverential. His studies in the theology of the East had broken off the shackles of custom, dogma, ritual and superstition. The study of Spencer, Mill, Huxley and Tyndall had brought on an agnostic frame of mind. Yet he was, side by side, a close student of Shankaracharya's Vedanta philosophy, of the Upanishads and the *Bhagavadgita*. He found solace in the poetry of Wordsworth, and an increasing delight, as life advanced, in the pages of Kempis, Ruskin, Carlyle, Arnold and the *Bible*." He strove to translate into action his belief that a new purpose be given to the life of every educated Indian and that the spirit of his heritage must gather fresh momentum for action from the energizing and progressive knowledge of the West.

Kashinath Trimbak Telang dominated the Indian political scene from 1872 to 1893, along with Dadabhai Naoroji, Mahadeo Govind Ranade and Sir Pherozeshah Mehta. Telang delivered his maiden speech in 1872 in support of the movement for municipal reform in Bombay, which gained him the reputation of a leading public speaker. He spoke on the Salt Act on 8 November 1873 in the Town Hall and recommended the opening of the Indian Civil Service to the Indians. Lytton's regime (1876-80) was known for several unjust and oppressive acts. The Vernacular Press Act gagged newspapers; taxation on imports was removed; salt-tax was increased; a fresh Licence Tax was imposed; War of Afghanistan was started. There was destruction of crops and life during 1877-78 due to famine. Criticising the 'Gagging Act' Telang said: "If there was one thing, more than another, to which an advocate of the British Government could point as marking unmistakably the superiority of it to bygone Governments, it was this reign of law—the liberty of speech and thought, which is now become to a considerable extent a thing of the past under the provisions of the Gagging Act. The reign of law," he continued, "is passed, ceasing under the hands of these sapient legislators who have been ruling during the past few years." Such was the feeling of active dislike and opposition to this Act that the people's agitation against it was kept alive till the Conservatives in England were defeated by the Liberals in 1880, under

Gladstone as the Prime Minister. The newly elected liberal-minded ministry appointed Lord Ripon as the Viceroy of India. The Gagging Act was abolished, Provincial Local Self-Government was encouraged, the Afghan War was stopped and the army withdrawn, the Salt Tax was reduced and an Education Commission was appointed.

On Saturday, 28 April, 1883 the Sheriff of Bombay convened a meeting of the Bombay citizens to discuss the Ilbert Bill for amending the Code of Criminal Procedure. In the deliberations on the Ilbert Bill Telang proved his political sagacity and sobriety of thought to a very considerable extent. "One great lesson," he said, "to be deduced from the history of Rome is that all conquering nations must, to render their Government suitable and permanent, divest themselves of their privileges by sharing them with the conquered people. If Britons now fail to carry out these lessons, I should be sorry for such a result."

At the time of the departure of Lord Ripon in December 1884, India had entered on a new and a most encouraging stage of her political existence. The Vernacular Press Act and the Ilbert Bill had shaken the country to its very depths and roused the educated Indians to act like one man. It was under such conditions that new political institutions to realize the new aspirations and sentiments of the Indian community were founded. No sketch of Telang would look complete without a reference to his patient and constructive work in connection with the Bombay Association and the East India Association in which Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherozeshah Mehta, Badruddin Tyabji and K. T. Telang collaborated. As a member of the Legislative Council, Telang resisted excessive Government action and interference with the free play of individual will. The electors and the elected should have their respective duties to perform. Telang occupied himself wholeheartedly with the work of the Congress from its inception. It had its first session in Bombay in 1885 and Telang's role in its deliberations was worthy of note. He insisted on the abolition of the India Council and the reform and expansion of the Indian Legislature. He wrote three leaflets (1) *Is India Lightly Taxed?*, (2) *Imperial Stock-taking*, and (3) *Manchester's Interest in India*, to be distributed among the English voters during the 1885 election. Exposing, in the first leaflet, the disparity between the 7½% tax on an Englishman's annual income of £33 and the 17% tax on an Indian's annual income of £2, Telang said: "The great mass of her [India's] people are in such a state of impoverishment that the Government will have to contend with exceptional difficulties, if it becomes necessary to procure increased revenue by additional taxation." Proving statistically the rise of Government expenditure from 1856 to 1876 to be more than double, that is from £1,49,64,867 to £3,33,52,852, Telang demanded in the second leaflet that "An investigation has now been long overdue. And the new Parliament cannot do a better thing than direct such an inquiry at the very outset of its career." In the last leaflet, he maintained that "Man-

chester's interest lies directly in promoting the prosperity of her Indian customers." India was better suited for cotton goods than England; the raw material was easily available here; Indian labour was much cheaper than English labour and the coal required for the industry was not inaccessible. Telang, therefore, pleaded that the price of foreign goods should be considerably reduced, and the young Indian industries, bearing all the germs of future prosperity, should be protected by the Government. Telang opposed with great vigour and forceful reasoning Lord Lytton's reduction of duties on Manchester goods in 1879. In fact, he may be called the Father of Indian Political Economy as he was the first to protest against the orthodox school of Political Economy in a paper read by him on "Free Trade and Protection" at the Sassoon Mechanic's Institute on 29 March 1877. He maintained that the general figures of the then Indian import and export trade did not afford the slightest support to the dogmatic Free Trade views. He indicated that "even from the purely economical point of view, even confining our attention to the means of increasing the aggregate production of the country, it is not desirable to permit our industry to be confined to agriculture." Telang was an uninterrupted and intense devotee to the cause of the Indian National Congress. All the utterances of Telang on the Congress platform concentrated on the evils of the bureaucratic system and its defiant attitude towards public opinion. His interpretation of the Queen's Proclamation on the question of the Age of Consent is a masterly exposition of the State's duty to its subjects. He argued that neutrality in matters of religious observances of the various communities does not preclude the State from the performance of its primary duty of protecting a person from physical harm. To protect a minor married girl from her husband's exercising his marital rights upon her or to protect her body from physical harm, was no interference with religion. Telang was also as ardent a social reformer as he was a thorough -going politician. His address "Should social reform precede political reform?" was a good answer to the then Lieutenant Governor of U.P., Sir Auckland Colvin, who maintained that socially backward India could not venture the achievement of political reform. Telang showed with facts and figures from eighteenth-century England that though it was socially backward, it fought for its political rights and won them. He concluded that India's agitation for political reform could not be stayed till she became socially perfect. In his judgement, the two must go hand in hand.

As a social reformer Telang occupied a very high position in the social activities of the Bombay Presidency during the last three decades of the nineteenth century. His chief collaborators in the social reform movements were Bhau Daji Lad, Dadabhai Naoroji, Naoroji Fardoonjee, R. S. Mandlik, Pherozeshah Mehta and Badruddin Tyabji. The major

social problems were (1) Child marriage, (2) Widow-marriage, (3) Female education, (4) Foreign travel, and (5) Inter-dining of castes. And Telang vehemently pleaded for social reforms to form one single integral system along with religious, political and economic reforms.

Telang considered female education as the greatest help and asset to solve all social problems. The object of the social reformers was to endeavour to improve the condition of women. They received considerable help and co-operation from the British Law Courts as could be gathered from a High Court judgement delivered by Justice West and Justice Birdwood round about 1886. The judgement stated that "Under no circumstances should the Judge force him [a candidate selected by the girl's paternal relations] or any other man on the girl whose views were to be consulted before the final selection was made."

In his lectures on the "Importance of Shastra and Custom" and "Compromise on Social Matters" as well as in his reply to Mr. Malabari's notes on "Infant Marriage and Enforced Widowhood", Telang's opposition to outworn orthodoxy was clearly visible; but so was also his disinclination to take hasty and radical measures. He clung to and revered the past and yet tried to keep his hold on the future by seeing the past gradually adapt itself to the new changing circumstances. "Just as science attacks superstition," he said, "not directly but by rendering the mental soil unfit for its cultivation, similarly, the reformer must exert to prepare the ground so as to render the growth of misplaced feelings and misunderstood prejudices impossible." While suggesting the difference in his own and Telang's points of view, Justice Ranade said: "Those who live in the past secure popularity. Those who bury their past obtain ease. Men like Telang and others obtain neither ease nor popularity by the very fact that they can neither hold by the past nor forget it altogether." Telang's tenderness for the emotional susceptibilities of his kith and kin made him shrink from any violation, even of their prejudices. And it was this submissive tenderness that caused Telang to get his own daughter married at the tender age of eight years. He knew well that his own family environment was not at all conducive to any radical social reform. Telang, however, refused to share the views of several Indian intellectuals of the time that the decline of religious rites and rituals was solely due to the presence and influence of the British Government. Referring to the conversion of a Brahmin, Shripat Sheshadri, to Christianity and his subsequent repentance, Telang stated that in spite of the disapproval of several Hindus to accept him again into the Hindu fold, Balshastri Jambhekar and Shankarsett took him back after his performance of a purificatory rite. In 1886 some Shastris met the then Governor of Bombay, Lord Reay, requesting the Government to introduce prohibition. But the same Shastris were very much against the Government's interference to stop 'child marriage'. Some other Shastris, in a different context, told Telang that if they were not asked about their

views regarding the acceptance of a foreign-returned back to his caste, they would not have any objection to such a person being accepted back to his society. There was, thus, a tendency to justify reform by an appeal to the Shastras against custom, and a spirit of compromise without the sacrifice of principle. To Telang "not mere revival, nor reform, but a careful adaptation of the old to the changed conditions of the new was necessary." He propagated patience and persistence and not precipitate action. "Reform ought to go," he said, "along the line of least resistance."

Referring to the above relaxation of social taboos, rites and rituals, Telang indicated through a very well-documented essay "Gleanings from the Maratha Chronicles" that such flexibility existed even during the Maratha period and that responsible officials and administrators helped the change in a proper direction. The prevailing degenerating practice of the sale of Brahmin girls and the inhuman practice of *Suttee* were severely prohibited. When, at Talegaon, a Brahmin woman was found living in adultery with a Muslim youth, the woman was banished from the kingdom and the male culprit was trampled to death under an elephant's foot. Bajirao could not succeed to get his son by a Muslim lady initiated as a Brahmin. Referring to a host of examples like the marriage of the Konkanastha Balaji Bajirao with the Deshastha Radhabai, the thread ceremony of Shivaji, the dining together of the Marathas and the Musalmans and of the Brahmins and the Kayastha Prabhus, Telang stated that while the Maratha power was at its height, defiling associations were condoned, sea-voyages were excused, widow-marriage was sanctioned by the most reverend authorities, and the duties of a Kshatriya, like warfare and bloodshed, when performed by Brahmins, were approved and glorified. Telang had given, with obvious relish, the example of Gopikabai advising, on the one hand, her grandson Peshwa Savai Madhavrao to restrict his religious duties, and on the other, a number of Brahmins to be useless in the performance of simple religious rites and rituals. This reflected a greater interest in secular outlook and lesser attention to religion and ritual even by the Brahmins. The society of the Maratha period reflected a general relaxation of the rigours of traditional bonds. Telang indicated in the same essay that the Maratha rule had a Brahmin Minister of Religion in the Council of Ashta Pradhans and that there was much interference in caste disputes which would have been intolerable during the nineteenth century. He, therefore, concluded his "Gleanings from Maratha Chronicles" by stating that "if Peshwa rule had continued a little longer, several of the social reforms which are now giving us and the British Government so much trouble would have been secured with immensely greater ease."

Telang was unequalled among his countrymen as an exponent of the rich heritage of Oriental literature. In spite of his multifarious activities he devoted some time to study the various problems of Sanskrit literature

from his early youth; and several of his writings in this field reflect a sound scholarship and moderate patriotism.

Early in 1870, Telang read a paper before the Students' Literary and Scientific Society on the life of Shankaracharya. In 1871 he read an essay before the Student's Society on *Muktikopanishad*. The first volume of the *Indian Antiquary*, started by Dr. Burgess in 1872, contained two essays by Telang; one was on the "Date of Nyaya Kusumanjali" and the other was a short "Note on Gomutra" in which he suggested that "however right Dr. Rajendralal Mitra might be in holding that there was a time in historic memory when the ancestors of the Hindus ate beef freely, that time came to an end some time before Christ." It is, however, known that right up to the seventh century, the practice of offering cow-calves or bulls as meals to honourable guests was common. Bhavabhuti, for example, describes beef-eating in his *Uttara Rama Charita*. How a beef-eating race became the greatest protector, preserver and worshipper of the cow, is one of the mysteries of ancient India. In 1873 Telang wrote an essay on the *Ramayana* refuting the contentions of Dr. Weber. The same year he also wrote an essay on the "Date of Sri Harsha" for the *Indian Antiquary*. In 1874 he wrote "Kalidasa, Sri Harsha and Chand", "Ramayana older than Patanjali", "The Parvatiparinaya of Bana" and "Note on the Ramayana" in the *Indian Antiquary*, and "A Note on the Age of Madhusudana Saraswati", the author of *Gita Gudartha Dipika*, in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*. In the same year he also read a paper before the Student's Society challenging the theory of Lorinser regarding the *Bhagavadgita*, that it was copied from the *Bible*. The essay was afterwards embodied as an introduction to the metrical translation of the *Divine Lay* published in 1875. In 1876 Telang wrote a note in the *Indian Antiquary* on "Shankaravijaya of Anandagiri", explaining that Shankaravijaya was, in all probability, a work of fourteenth century and that consequently it could not be the work of Anandagiri, the pupil of Shankaracharya. In 1884 he wrote on the "Date of Shankaracharya" in the *Indian Antiquary*, suggesting that he lived in the sixth century. In 1885 he wrote in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Asiatic Society* a paper on "Badarayana, the Author of the Brahmasutras" and in 1889, on "Purnavarma and Shankaracharya". During the next year appeared in the same journal his "Gleanings from the Shariraka Bhashya of Shankaracharya" and a year later (1891) his "Subandhu and Kumarila". In all these writings one finds an honest investigation of facts, with no attempt to present only the favourable evidences and to avoid the unfavourable ones. Every aspect is examined dispassionately and all material is sifted with a critical insight. All these qualities befit Telang as a historian.

Telang found time also to edit in 1874 works like Bhartrihari's *Niti Shataka* and *Vairagya Shataka*, and in 1884 Vishakhadatta's *Mudra Rakshasa*, based on various manuscripts, for the Bombay Sanskrit Series. In these

editions he discussed the dates of the authors of the texts, examining all available evidences, referring to sources in the foot-notes and commenting on the acceptance or rejection of the prevailing views. In his 'Introduction to *Mudra Rakshasa*' he fixed the eighth century as the date of Vishakhadatta, rejecting the eleventh century as fixed by Dr. Wilson. He blamed the Archaeological Survey Report for not making an independent investigation and blindly following Dr. Wilson's date.

In the *Indian Antiquary* of February 1882, Telang's review "Hindu Law or Mayukha and Yajnavalkya" of Mandlik's edition and translation of Nilakantha Bhatta's *Vyavaharamayukha* and translation of the *Yajnavalkya Smriti* blames Mandlik for not procuring the various manuscripts from the different parts of India for the final constitution of the text, and points out a number of inaccuracies in the translations.

To write at the young age of twenty a life of Shankaracharya was in itself no mean literary effort. And that was, moreover, the time when the European writers found it difficult to appreciate the excellence and antiquity of India's literary treasures.

Telang refuted Max Müller and dated Shankaracharya to the latter half of the sixth century A.D. According to Max Müller the Indian philosopher belonged to 788 A.D. He also pointed out that the *Brahma Sutras* of Badarayana dated back to a remoter age than 400 or 500 A.D. assigned by Weber. In his paper on the date of Madhusudan Saraswati, Telang challenged the views of Lassen and Burnouf that Madhusudan lived in the sixteenth century. He concluded that this Indian author flourished either at the end of the fifteenth or at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Telang's two essays on the *Ramayana* and the *Bhagavadgita* in refutation of the pet theories of Western scholars like Weber and Lorinser that they were borrowings from the Greek *Iliad* and Christian *New Testament* and that they were not very ancient literary works, brought out completely the cultural value of these writings and their place in the literary evolution of India. These essays gave him a reputation as an antiquarian scholar.

In his essay "Was the Ramayana copied from Homer?", Telang gave a conclusive reply to the veteran Sanskritist, Prof. Albrecht Weber, and proved that the *Ramayana* was older than Patanjali and that it was absurd to regard the Sanskrit epic as a Buddhist saga called Dasharatha Jataka based on the Homeric story of the Trojan war. This essay, refuting the contentions of Dr. Weber, was read in 1873. Telang maintained that the Buddhist story could have been as well borrowed from the *Ramayana*. It was quite improbable that a Buddhist, argued Telang, should be adopted as a Brahmanical hero. He also argued that the whole moral and mental atmosphere of the *Ramayana* was very much different from that of the *Iliad*. He even contemplated an eastern origin of the Homeric legend.

Telang similarly refuted the arguments of Dr. F. Lorinser who said

that (i) the *Bhagavadgita* was dated after the Buddha; (ii) its composition could be attributed to a period several centuries after the commencement of the Christian era; (iii) its composer was influenced by the New Testament, and (iv) the date of the composition of the *Gita* be left an open question till the finalisation of the date of Shankaracharya. Telang refuted the arguments of Lorinser that the date of the *Gita* was somewhere near the eighth century A.D. He proved in his essay "Was the *Gita* copied from the Bible?" that the *Gita* ranged itself as a member of the Upanishad group and therefore dated not later than the third century B.C. Indicating the differences between the Heavens of Jesus and Krishna and the righteousness of Jesus and the abandoning desires of Krishna, Telang concluded that "the Christian writings must have borrowed from the *Gita*", and that it seemed to him more likely that the *Gita* was earlier in date than the Buddha.

It was after finishing his studies and qualifying for the profession that Telang turned his attention to antiquarian work and researches into Indian history. When he wrote the life of Shankaracharya, Wacha remarked: "It shows the ardour and the scholastic instinct of the genuine student of history at that early age." In 1876 he had read an essay in the Student's Society on the "Study of History" and went through a course of study in Biblical criticism and read some works on the "Proofs of Historical Criticism" before writing his well-known paper in reply to Prof. Weber.

In 1875 Telang read a learned paper before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society on "A New Chalukya Copper-Plate". The letters being irregularly formed and the language defective, the grant was considered to be spurious. In the next year he read another essay on the "Three Kadamba Copper-Plates" before the same Society. In 1878 he read a paper in the Students' Society on the Ancient People of Bharatakhanda and wrote about "A New Shilahara Copper-Plate Grant" in the *Indian Antiquary* of February 1880. In the same year he wrote another note, in the same journal, on the useful Marathi Serial, the "Kavyetihasa Samgraha", recommending it to the readers as a work devoted to the publication of original sources of Maratha history. Though he praised the undertaking very enthusiastically, he exposed the uncritical attitude of the editors to have "permitted themselves to make sundry alterations in the text of the *Bakhar* in order to make the narrative more perspicuous." In 1885 he published "The Copper-Plate Grant of Pulakeshin II" in the *Indian Antiquary*. Besides several papers on matters connected with Indian Epigraphy offering very valuable observations, Telang's last work which calls for particular notice was his "Gleanings from Maratha Chronicles", a paper read in the Deccan College Union and subsequently added as an Appendix to M. G. Ranade's *Rise of the Maratha Power*. Utilising many of the manuscript sources like the Maratha Bakhars and Chronicles used by Captain James Grant Duff, Telang wrote an interesting account of

the social, religious and political life under the Peshwas. He indicated that the frequent instances of political treachery reflected a real debasement of moral feeling and were evidence of a general debility of character which resulted in the downfall of the Marathas. Showing the role played by the Peshwas in social reforms, Telang concludes: "I am inclined strongly to draw the inference...that if Peshwa rule had continued a little longer, several of the social reforms which are now giving us and the British Government so much trouble would have been secured with immensely greater ease."

Historiography was practically unknown to the Indians at the beginning of the nineteenth century. But with the spread of English education in the second quarter of that century the educated Indians learnt the usefulness of historical knowledge from Englishmen whose historical writings were "obstinately political". Most of the historical writing was done by British administrators to arouse interest in the Indian Empire. It was meant for home consumption and betrayed prejudices formed during their administrative career in India. It reflected their passion for national heroes at the expense of historical proportion. The failure of India to develop nationalities was attributed to the tyranny established by the Brahmin priesthood and the consequent withering away of all political loyalties, and it was maintained that India had "only been saved from the most hopeless of anarchies by the introduction of European rule" (J. Tallboys Wheeler, *History Under British Rule*). Indian laws and institutions, it was said, reflected a society with "one of the rudest and weakest states of the human mind." Indian society was considered to be "a mere loose conglomeration of tribes, races, and castes" (Lyall, *The Rise and Expansion of British Dominion in India*). There was a systematic, conscious and deliberate effort to minimize the importance of Indian history and culture, to deny its antiquity, to suggest the indebtedness of its epics to Homer's works, to prove the Krishna cult to be derived from Christ, and to state that the Indian drama, philosophy, astronomy and mathematics were all borrowed from the Greeks.

The inevitable reaction and natural resentment were not long in coming. The English-educated Indians were provoked beyond measure by the prejudiced tone of the English writers. It not only developed in them a frantic desire to study the historical facts which would enable them to refute the charges of the foreigners, but also resulted in a zeal to vindicate their past culture against the European charges. The anti-British feeling associated with the Indian struggle for freedom ushered in a nationalist historiography. Though originally it was a reaction against the British historians of India, later on it gathered inspiration from national consciousness. It was marked by an intense hatred against the British. It was aggressive and defensive.

Telang belonged to this school of writers whose national consciousness was marked by a dislike for the British. Its major theme included the economic exploitation of India, involving the ruin of trade and industry. A revived Hinduism had sprung into prominence and it was maintained that India possessed a high standard of civilization. Scientific inventions like the aeroplane and political devices like nationalism of the nineteenth century were discovered in the Vedic literature. Superiority of Hindusim over Christianity was asserted. The Vedas were fixed to the third millennium B.C. and the composition of some of the hymns of the Rigveda to ancient geological epochs. The sole purpose appeared to be the glorification of India's past. This attitude was, naturally, responsible for the occasional lapses from true historical virtues like balanced judgement, proper perspective and detached assessment. It was a patriotic error.

Telang was no revolutionary either in politics or social reform. He preferred to be in the second line of opposition against the British. He avoided strife and vehemence. He knew well that his own family environment was not conducive to social reforms. In his behaviour towards his parents he remained silent if his own opinion differed from theirs. Like an obedient son, Telang asked leave of his mother every day before leaving for the court. Telang had shocked many when this stalwart reformer consented to the marriage of his own daughter at a very early age just to please his parents. Telang who advocated widow-marriage was known to have avoided dinner in the house of such a couple. Though suffering acutely from a painful complaint which a simple operation would have cured completely, Telang surprised many by refusing to undergo it simply because his parents did not approve of it. When asked about this incident by an English friend, Telang replied: "Ah, if it were only myself, the doctors could do what they like with me tomorrow. But my old father—adopted father too, remember, and mother have the most inveterate objection to the slightest use of the knife, to the shedding of a drop of blood. You will probably think me a fool," he added, with his happy smile, "but after all I am a Hindu of the old stock...." But if Telang had not the courage to do what he thought he ought to do, he never put a gloss on his conduct—rather he was conscious of his shortcoming.

The greatness of Telang was at bottom necessarily a Hindu greatness. The conservation of the essential qualities of Hindu culture and its ideals was always reflected in his speeches and writings. His intense longing was for the progress of the Hindus. Pherozeshah Mehta has also described him as "a true and sincere Hindu of Hindus". And in his essay on the "Life of Shankaracharya" read in the Student's Society in 1870, Telang himself said: "I am first and last a Hindu." He was the President of the Hindu Union Club founded by Ramchandra Bhikaji Gunjikar (1874) to bring about harmony between the élite among the Hindus of all communities.

Telang's Hindu bias could be seen in his arguments in "The Date of Sri Harsha", published in the *Indian Antiquary* (1873). Comparing the Hindu and Jain-literary sources he argued: "Whom, then, shall we believe? Regarding the biography of a Hindu poet, is it more likely that the Jaina Suri or the Hindu Acharya erred?" The net result of Telang's investigation was that "The Jaina biographer's account, albeit it has some points in its favour, cannot be much trusted."

The depth of his fervour in the cause of Hindu culture could be gauged even from the way in which Telang dealt with Weber's views of the *Ramayana*. "I own, indeed," argued Telang, "that the conclusion, to which the learned and elaborate reasoning of Prof. Weber has led him, is not one with which any Hindu will be much gratified. To be told that the *Ramayana*—that noble work with which so many of one's pleasing and exalting associations are bound up—that work which sings the superhuman exploits of a deified man, who, beyond almost any other Deity in their Pantheon, is the greatest favourite of the Hindus of this day—that work which has ingrained itself in the very life of the nation, so that there is scarcely a Hindu who is not more or less acquainted with the plot—to be told that after all that work is nothing more than a Buddhist saga dovetailed to the Homeric story of the Trojan War, that causes a shock to one's notions under which not many will find it easy to be stoical." "In spite of that want of a 'historical sense' with which our people have been often charged, and I must admit not unjustly charged," observed Telang, in the same context, "I cannot believe that such an almost outrageous opinion could be held by any Hindu who knew anything of literature." To say the least, these remarks sound more emotional than reasonable. They show Telang to be more of a sentimental Hindu Sanskritist than a radical Indian historian, who fails to realise the reactions of the Buddhists to his assessment and to appreciate well their contribution to Indian history and culture. These remarks do not seem to reckon with the possibility of the parallel episodes of the *Ramayana* and the *Iliad* on one hand, and of the Buddhist and Hindu traditions, on the other, to be originating from an independent and much earlier source common to both, and not necessarily from each other. And in an academic discussion there need not be anything to cause "a shock to one's notions".

Telang's views about the *Bhagavadgita* also reflect his interest more in establishing its "originality and antiquity" than in refuting the arguments of Dr. Lorinser. "It appears to me," Telang writes, "that in these days there has set in a powerful tendency in Europe to put down individual works and classes of works of our ancient Sanskrit literature to as late a date as possible...; it is this that is temporarily doing damage to its antiquity." He, however, does not seem to realise that the same type of damage is done to historical research by going to the other extreme of pushing back the antiquity of Sanskrit literary works to the maximum. Here also one finds

the high pitch of the Hindu nationalist sentiment in Telang. He not only states that the *Bhagavadgita* is earlier than the *Bible* and lends its philosophy to the latter, but also asserts that the *Gita* is earlier than the Buddha also. Subsequent research has proved the *Bhagavadgita* to be a harmonious work including all the previous religious thoughts. It refers not only to the Upanishads and the three Vedas (IX, 20-21), the Samkhya, Yoga and Vedanta (IV, 15) but also to Brahma Nirvana (II, 72) and Shanti Nirvana (XVI, 8) reflecting Buddhist influence.

Telang's views prove that he could not break with the traditional past altogether. "If we do not restore to our Smritis," he said in one of his lectures, "the life and elasticity, which they possessed in the palmiest days of Hindu Society, our religion will cease to be a living force." In the Foreword to the second volume of *Select Writings and Speeches of K. T. Telang*, V. N. Naik writes that all these writings "lead up to one purpose, namely, to restore in their proper light and setting what is vital, abiding and worth cherishing in India's ancient culture and religion."

The glorification of national heritage during the nineteenth century became more of a hindrance than an aid to the future progress of historical writing. But the nationalist school of history to which Telang belonged has not faded away from independent India. The tendency towards orthodoxy in interpreting the religious ideas and social institutions of the past, and the desire to remodel India according to the genius of India's cultural past, still survive. The nationalist sentiment still continues. The impact of the western scientific and technological society has been painfully slow even during the twentieth century.

Telang was one of the two Indian scholars invited to contribute to the *Sacred Books of the East*, the other one being Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar. And it was for Telang's reverence for, and knowledge of "India's Past" that R. W. Frazer has described him in his *Literary History of India* as one of the "creative geniuses who are destined to shine clear as glowing sparks sent out in the fiery furnace where the old and the new were fusing."

"During his short life of 43 years, Telang compressed so much reading, writing, thought and action," said Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar in his Presidential Address at the Telang Centenary Celebration in Bombay, "that, figuratively, we pant for breath as we follow the story of his career." He was a great Sanskrit scholar, a deep student of Marathi literature and history, a discerning student of Western literature and thought, a versatile writer and speaker, a social and economic reformer and the most active worker in the political field. The extent and quality of his research publications were laudable. His learning was deep, his reasoning penetrating, his energy remarkable, his love and sympathy for his countrymen admirable and his zeal for establishing the antiquity of Indian culture astonishing.

Seeking liberation for his country in social, economic and political spheres, Telang was proud of the past and hopeful of the future. The work of Lokamanya Tilak and Dr. Besant and the later labours of Mahatma Gandhi would have been infructuous if the generation of Telang had not sedulously helped to rouse and vindicate the self-respect of Indians and reiterated their insistent demand for equality with Englishmen. India lost in Telang, in the words of John Adam, "one of her most brilliant scholars, one of her choicest speakers and one of the best of men."

VISHWANATH KASHINATH RAJWADE

G. H. KHARE

(*Bharat Itihas Samsodhak Mandala, Poona*)

VISHWANATH KASHINATH RAJWADE was born in Poona on 12 July 1864, in a comparatively poor but respectable Chitpavan Brahmin family, which section of the Brahmin community is reputed to be thrifty, intelligent, fair-looking and hardworking. His father, an ordinary pleader, practised in Poona; he died when Rajwade was only three years old. His mother somehow managed to educate both V. K. Rajwade and his elder brother Vaijanath, who later on became a renowned professor of Sanskrit and English. Rajwade passed his Matriculation examination in 1882 and prosecuted his higher studies at Wilson and Elphinstone Colleges in Bombay and then at the Deccan College, Poona, graduating in about 1890. It appears that he was rather late in graduating. But possibly it was due to—as he himself had noted at one place—his not studying the prescribed text books, but reading extra-curricular works on history, sociology, religion, etc. After graduation he either conducted second grade public service classes or served in a school in Poona for about three years during which period he married, and had two children but unfortunately lost both his wife and his children.

After this catastrophe he left service and never thought of serving anywhere else again. Instead he decided to devote his life to research in history, sociology, linguistics and other humanistic subjects. From 1893 to the end of his life, without paying the least heed to the problem of his maintenance, he took to the collection of material for research in humanities and publish the results of his studies. He never swerved from the path which he had decided to follow. It became the mission of his life. He remained in abject poverty, but never thought of anything else except the mission of his life. Just imagine a penniless man who had decided to collect old historical and cultural material, such as records, manuscripts and inscriptions by visiting big cities and towns as well as far-off villages which had no bullock-cart tracks even and where walking was the only course left open. One cannot even imagine what hardships he had to bear. They can be compared with those of the Curie couple, Plenderlith and Rahula Sankrityayana.

After writing some stray articles in the newspaper *Samartha* of Kolhapur and after conducting the periodical *Bhasantara* for four years in which he published the Marathi version of Plato's *Republic*, he took to publishing his monumental series of historical material—mostly original

records—termed "Marathyanchya Itihasachim Sadhanem". Between 1898 and 1921 he somehow or other managed to publish twenty-two volumes in this series at a great sacrifice. As usual it was with the greatest difficulty that he could publish the first volume of this series, which landed him into a debt of Rs. 800. The next volumes (nos. 2, 3 and 5-8) he got published in the journal *Grantha-mala*, as an honorarium for which he received fifty copies of each volume which he sold for defraying the debt already incurred in publishing volume 1. Volume 4 was published by the proprietor of Chitrasala on his own responsibility. Volumes 16, 17, 18, 19 and 22 he managed to publish in the now defunct quarterly *Itihasa-sangraha* that was being conducted by the late Parasnis. Volumes 12 and 20 were published by the Bharata Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandala. The remaining volumes (nos. 9, 11, 13-15 and 21) were published by arrangement with some private agencies.

In addition to these twenty-two volumes he managed to publish the following noticeable works: (1) *Mahikavatichi Bakhar* or a narrative about Mahim (Thana), (2) *Radhamadhavavilasachampu*, a poem on Radhamadhava and Shahaji, (3) and (4) *Jnanesvari and its Grammar*. Besides these works he wrote and published a number of monographs, such as *Colonization of Maharashtra*, *Kadambari*, *Ramadasa*, etc. and articles on a variety of subjects connected with Indian linguistics, sociology, history, philology, Marathi literature, etc., such as the date of Panini, assimilation of non-Hindus into the Hindu society, etc. Their number will come to about 400.

During the years 1890 to 1896, Rajwade studied very deeply the Marathi *Bakhar* literature supposed to be narrating Maratha history along with the very scanty original contemporary correspondence which had been already published by that time, and came to the unavoidable conclusion that the *Bakhar* literature on Maratha history was unreliable for getting at the truth. For they contained a number of mistakes of commission, omission and misrepresentation. Due to this reason, he discarded Grant Duff's *History of the Marathas* also, as it was more or less based on this literature though Duff had used original contemporary records in some places. He also concluded that it was the primary duty of a serious student of Maratha history to collect, study and publish contemporary correspondence, orders, etc.; for it was this material alone that would, when studied properly, present a true picture of that history. He also hoped that as there were hundreds of families in and around Maharashtra who had participated in the making of Maratha history in the immediate past, he would be able to find such material in their homes. He succeeded to a great extent in this direction after a hard work of several years. For though several families possessed such records, the holders of such records feared that if these were published it would either be harmful to their holdings or to their esteem in the eyes of the general public and therefore the present descendants were generally unwilling even to show them to him. He had

to persuade them first and then go on with salvaging, examining, selecting and copying the records then and there in spite of inconveniences of boarding, lodging, etc. But he never swerved from his goal which he thought to be the mission of his life. He could on very rare occasions remove the records to a place where he would be free from the inconveniences and get the assistance of copyists.

In his college days, instead of studying the prescribed text books, he devoted his time to the study of world-history in general and Indian and Maratha history in particular, eastern and western economics, politics, sociology, logic, ethics, philosophy, theology and a variety of other subjects in humanities, botany and other subjects included in science and acquired a working knowledge of Persian and French. From his studies it is evident that he realised the necessity of knowing all the above subjects for a thorough study of history in all its aspects. But why he studied botany and French is a bit inexplicable. It may be due to his firm belief that lack of knowledge of sciences was the main reason for India's bondage and for a thorough understanding of world affairs, knowledge of the French language was quite essential. His knowledge of Persian was no more than elementary. In the introduction to the eighth volume of his sources of the history of the Marathas, he had written in some detail on the influence of Persian on Marathi, which shows that he had acquainted himself with Persian grammar through English medium and that he had a very high power of imagination. But how far he could decipher original Persian records and how far he had mastered Persian vocabulary is a matter of doubt.

In almost each and every historical family in Maharashtra and in the regions adjoining it, one comes across Persian records, along with Marathi -Modi and Perso-Marathi-Modi or in rare cases Perso-Kannada bilingual records. Rajwade collected, deciphered and copied hundreds of Marathi records and Marathi portions of Perso-Marathi records. In a number of instances it has been found that Persian records and Persian portions of Perso-Marathi records not only corroborated Marathi records but supplied altogether new information. But owing to his inability to decipher the Persian script, he left the whole field of the purely Persian portions of bilingual records untouched and untraversed. Owners of such records, though averse to show Marathi-Modi records for they knew the gist of that material, were very willing to show the Persian material because they were very eager to know their contents, as a Persian knowing collector and editor was a rarity in that period. But owing to the lack of necessary knowledge of Persian, material in that language had been left untouched by Rajwade.

An honest collector and editor of original material must mention the source from which he acquired the material. He must note the place, the date and the owner of the material with his address, the circumstances in which he acquired it, how far he had made his search and where he had

deposited the collected material. These details certainly help the successors in the field to ascertain how far they should tap the same sources again or acquire the same records for the solution of some difficulties connected with their texts. Rajwade in some places has given full details about the sources, but in others he has maintained complete silence. For instance, he has written practically not a word by way of introduction to his volumes 9, 12 and 15 to 22. Now one has to surmise, conjecture and enquire to ascertain the exact possessors of the material if one is required to go through the same material or if one intends to make further search for acquiring Persian and additional Marathi material. It may be that Rajwade occasionally salvaged particular materials by unusual means and he did not like to divulge the source. But he could have overcome the difficulty by noting all the details secretly and allowing them to be published posthumously. But he seems not to have done this and the loss of the posterity is irreparable.

Rajwade edited Marathi-Modi papers in thousands. Papers of the Peshwa period except those of the nature of land grants are generally incompletely dated and the editor has to date them. Now dating is a very vexing and laborious task. Considering the dearth of original material, he has done his job well. Half of the dates fixed by him are correct and for the incorrect half he is not to be blamed for the above reason. For the Peshwa period he used the Modak ephemeris for converting Muslim and Hindu dates into Christian ones. But that ephemeris begins with the Saka year 1650 (1728 A.D.). For converting the dates of records of the earlier period he could not get any ephemeris to use, it seems, though there were the tables by Wustenfeld and others. He did not have the time to work out the conversion of each Musli n date into a Hindu and Christian one with the help of Sewell and Dikshit's *Indian Calendar*. The result is that dates given by him to records of the above period are only approximately correct and not quite accurate, and in a number of cases he has altogether left out dating such records.

In the period when he was striving very hard to collect records and manuscripts, he generally got them for copying in the houses of their owners and not at his residence. He could not generally have any assistance for either copying that material or comparing. He had to do both the jobs himself. Again, when he sent his works to a press he had to do all the proof correction himself. It followed from these circumstances that the texts of old records and works published by him are not as faithful as they should have been and could not be safely relied on for phonology, etymology, etc. When he published the oldest extant text of *Jnanesvari* with a facsimile of a page from it, this became manifest and he was severely criticised. But for historical purposes, his texts will serve well; for there long or short vowels, conjunct or simple consonants, nasal or simple sounds matter very little in most cases.

While in search of historical material Rajwade sometimes acquired

copperplates and came across stone inscriptions. But he had not studied well palaeography and epigraphy, i.e. he was not competent to handle that material properly. So while editing that material he committed palpable mistakes. At Mangalvedhe (Sholapur) he came across a single copperplate. Its very size, form, script, date and corrupt Marathi language would have convinced anyone in the field of its spuriousness even at the outset. But Rajwade would not have it that way. As the year 410 mentioned in it could not be reconciled with the very late type of script, etc., he gave rein to his unbounded imagination and propounded that the year 410 belonged to an era initiated by the Silaharas of Kolhapur in Saka 715 and the copperplate belonged to the Saka year 1125. But there was nothing in the text which showed that it had some distant or faint connection with the Silaharas. All the editing of this plate was, therefore, hopelessly incorrect. Same was the case with the Lasur stone inscription. Though obliterated, we can definitely state that it is dated in the Saka year 1446 and is in Marathi. But Rajwade's imagination turned it into a Sanskrit one and he dated it in the Saka year 1146. For some reason or other Rajwade subsequently gave up the study of old inscriptions and no more mistakes were committed by him in this field of study.

Rajwade is well-known for his very lengthy introductions to his works, sometimes dealing wholly or partly with the material contained in the respective works and sometimes without practically touching upon it. In some cases there are no introductions to his works at all. Thus his volumes of source-material nos. 1, 2, 3 have introductions dealing wholly or partly with the material contained in them. Introduction to volume 4 does not deal specifically with the material published in it, but with the general character of such material, i.e. *Bakhar* type material. Volumes 5 and 7 have no introductions as such; for their prefaces contain a few introductory remarks about the find-spots and owners of the material and how the material came to the editor's hand. Introduction to volume 6, after giving some details about the material embodied in it, enters into a very long discussion about the meaning of history, philosophy of history, the types of histories written up to his time, etc. Then after dealing with the drawbacks and defects of regional, provincial or national histories, he has concluded that writing dynastic histories is the best type of history-writing; for in it we can describe the expansion, recession, revival, merits, demerits, drawbacks and contributions of a ruler in the best way possible. His introductions to the *Mahikavatichi Bakhar* and *Radhamadhavavilasachampu* are of the same nature. After dealing partly with the material published in the body of the books, he enters into discussions on the colonization of the North Konkan and Maharashtra by various races and clans and has drawn some conclusions which are difficult to accept. But his manner of expounding his theories through the medium of lucid and forceful Marathi language is such that readers are taken in by his theories.

As he firmly believed that only institutions and not individuals would accelerate the all-round progress of Indians, he tried to found a number of institutions, originally local and regional; but he expected that the same would become all-India ones in due course. Health centres were one, Institutes of Scientific Research were another. Bharata Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandala was the third, Historical Research Institute, Amalner, was the fourth and so on. But the time was not ripe or favourable for founding these institutes and all of them except the B. I. S. Mandala died a natural death. B. I. S. Mandala is the only one which has assumed some form and is slowly becoming known to the outer world.

He was a convinced nationalist and was ever conscious of the innumerable sufferings to which Indians were subjected by the foreign British rule. According to him, the main cause of Indian slavery was the utter neglect by Indians of the study of sciences. By science he meant not only experimental sciences, such as Chemistry, Physics, etc., or sciences of observation, such as Astronomy, Archaeology, etc.; but all mental and social sciences, such as Politics, Sociology, etc. He very vehemently advocated this belief whenever he found an occasion.

One aspect of his very strong and pure nationalistic tendencies was his firm belief that if anybody were to take any help from the foreign government, he would be unable to make a proper search for truth even in non-political and cultural fields. He, therefore, shunned the idea of taking any help directly from the then provincial and central governments or indirectly from government-aided institutes, such as universities, Asiatic Societies, etc. But here he beguiled himself and his compatriots. The late Parasnis's publications of original material have been indeed vitiated by a certain element of dishonesty owing to his directly receiving government help. For it has been found that Parasnis had deleted remarks or expressions derogatory to the British from the original material published by him. But the same cannot be said of the Deccan Vernacular Translation Society which received monetary assistance from the government of Bombay. I do not think that their editors have intentionally suppressed anything ignominious to the British.

Another aspect of his nationalistic spirit was his zeal for writing in Marathi. He advocated vehemently the use of the mother tongue for literary work so much so that even though he had read hundreds of English books and even used to think in English, he wrote not a single line in any language other than Marathi. Marathi language and literature were indeed immensely enriched by his writings; but the one disadvantage of this inclination is that non-Marathi knowing people cannot benefit from his writings easily. Another drawback is that thinking that his readers were only laymen he had not taken as much care to substantiate his statements by evidence as he ought to have done. But the Marathi language he has used is so lucid, convincing and clear that a reader is led away by the

impression that everything that he has said is absolutely correct. It is only after deep thinking that a reader can find out defects in his arguments, and after an independent study of the material, can point out evidence against his statements.

It is certainly true that during the last half century the comparative study of antiquarian remains excavated from a number of places in India and elsewhere, the study of languages from Mon-Khmer group that are still spoken by some communities in India, the more detailed and comparative study of Dravidian languages and culture and a comparative study of Indo-Aryan and Indo-Iranian languages, have revolutionised our ideas about ancient Indian history and culture. Many of Rajwade's theories and discussions, therefore, may now appear quite queer and incorrect. Still there is sure to remain much that is perfectly correct, and one wonders at his very high power of imagination and clarity of thought. He was not only an intellectual giant but his power of imagination was even greater than his intelligence. Like the mathematician Ramanujam he arrived at the correct conclusions without even thinking of the intermediate steps.

In his last years he roamed over the country in search of new historical and cultural material and devoted his time to the preparation and compilation of two dictionaries of Marathi verbal stems and noun stems. But he could not complete the two lexicons. This work taxed his brain so heavily that he had a severe attack of apoplexy, and died on 31 December 1926. Thus passed away a great luminary in the field of historical research.

Nearly forty-two years have passed since his death. During this period his writings have been studied by scholars from different angles. Many of his conclusions have been challenged; but an equal number have been wonderfully borne out by subsequent research and evidence. Intensive study in future may perhaps prove more of his theories and conclusions to be incorrect. But his selfless devotion to his mission, his untiring zeal and his readiness to bear any hardship and to make any sacrifice for his mission have inspired and will certainly continue to inspire younger generations to follow in his footsteps as long as his writings are alive and are being read. The material he has so laboriously collected and published will ever remain fresh and invaluable.

DATTATRAY BALWANT PARASNIS

V. G. KHOBREKAR

(*Bombay Archives*)

RAO BAHADUR DATTATRAY BALWANT PARASNIS (1870-1926) proved to be a romantic researcher whose field was wide and whose ways were not always scholarly. He combined in him rare virtues and natural gifts which he used for making a strikingly varied collection for a personal museum. He provided original historical material on a variety of topics which were not much explored before. Without doubt, he was a research scholar of rare ability, a frequent visitor to the aristocratic castles and palaces and official residences, and a man of sweet tongue and winning manners.

Dattatray Balwant Parasnis was born at Satara on 27 November 1870. His family migrated from their home Malwali in Mal Taluka to Satara where young Dattatray was brought up. Though naturally intelligent and possessed of a keen memory, he did not prosecute his college education. He studied up to the Matriculation standard in the Satara High School. In his school days, he read Marathi books extensively, especially historical biographies. He also acquired a good knowledge of the English language and widened his outlook by reading English books on history and literature.

Parasnis came from a middle-class family. His father was an officer in the Revenue Department. As the name implies, the hereditary office of Parasnis (Persian writer) was that of translators and writers of Persian letters and documents. In 1887 he wrote a journal *Subhashya Chandrika* comprising about sixteen pages. In the same year he began to publish a magazine *Maharashtra Kokil*. Through this magazine he published biographies of eminent heroes of Indian history. In 1890 he published his first book *Kirti-Mandir*. This was welcomed by Sir T. Madhavrao, Diwan of Travancore. The publication of the *Maharashtra Kokil* ceased in 1892. Parasnis became well-known because of this magazine. Without holding any regular job or office, Parasnis was able to establish good contacts with high Government officials on the one hand and with Princes, Sardars and their *Karbharis* on the other. Commercial magnates too used to come to him. Endowed with a sweet tongue and pleasing manners, Parasnis was popular in the élite circle he had chosen for himself. He was often asked to negotiate with the high officials on behalf of this prince or that, for minor favours or for removal of misunderstandings. A successful negotiation naturally brought in its wake a deserving reward and Parasnis thus climbed up the ladder of success. In the courts of the Southern Maratha states in particular, he was

a much sought-after person. His mastery over the English language and his impressive personality served him well.

Parasnis was thus able to establish himself as a respectable visitor in the high official circles and delightful company for the princes of many states. Fortune soon smiled on him and he was able to acquire some property at Satara. During the period of his visits to the courts and offices, Parasnis did not swerve from his most cherished aim: that of collecting and printing old historical papers, of publishing old pictures and providing material for historical research. When, during one of his visits to Europe in the company of the Maharaja of Kolhapur, he was able to see some of the best museums in England (1902), he was possessed by the idea of having a museum of his own at Satara. Towards that end he started collecting suitable material. Historical papers were of course there. But dresses, arms, ornaments, paintings, seals and coins, all were needed by him for exhibition in his proposed museum.

To this laudable effort of Parasnis, recognition was not slow to come. High British officials and visitors from England made it a point to pay a visit to Satara to see the collection. Those were the days when the Prince of Wales Museum in Bombay had not been built. Dr. Thomas, the Librarian of the India Office Library, and J. S. Cotton, Editor, *Imperial Gazetteers of India*, paid high compliments to Parasnis on seeing his collection. Charles A. Kincaid, I. C. S., recommended to the Government that a building for a historical museum at Satara be constructed and the collection of Parasnis be acquired for it. Accordingly a building was constructed in 1924.

While Parasnis was allowed to work in the Peshwa Daftar, which was not open officially to research students, his efforts outside official spheres, at the darbars of Indore, Gwalior and other states, brought him much valuable material which he immediately published in book form. *Maheshwar Darbarchi Batamipatren* (Letters from the Maheshwar Darbar) made two volumes and they contain first class original historical material. *Delhitil Marathyanchi Rajakarane* (Maratha Politics at Delhi) similarly made a great contribution to the study of Northern Affairs. Gwalior papers were published in a limited edition of five volumes which were later edited and published by G. S. Sardesai as *Historical Papers Relating to Mahadji Sindhia* (Gwalior, 1937). It contains 608 Marathi letters written during 1774-92. The period coincides with the Maratha expansion after the battle of Panipat. Incidentally, Sir Jadunath Sarkar contributed an important foreword in English to this volume and it throws a flood of light on the ways of Parasnis. Sir Jadunath had already introduced, through the columns of the *Modern Review*, the select group of research workers in Maharashtra, who were engaged in collecting and publishing original historical papers, of whom Parasnis was one.

After securing co-operation from other contemporary scholars engaged in historical research, Parasnis tried to conduct journals devoted to publish-

ing original material which he could obtain through his contacts with princes and rulers. The *Bharatavarsha* and the *Kavyetihasa Sangraha* were two periodicals which during their brief career were able to contribute in a substantial way to historical research. The matter, initially published periodically, was partly published in book form. But most of the material yet remains unexploited fully, as the copies of the old periodicals are rare and the paper used in those days proved too brittle to last long. Biographies of Brahmendra Swami, Bayjabai Shinde, the Nawabs of Oudh and the Ghorpades of Mudhol are some of his striking books. But Parasnis became well known because the British historian, Charles A. Kincaid, I.C.S., had him as the joint author of the three-volume *History of the Marathas*. It is not easy to ascertain the exact role played by Parasnis in this great task. But Kincaid's correspondence with Sardesai over simple matters which Parasnis could have easily solved, raises the unanswered question: What exactly was the role of Parasnis in that *Chitpavan Epic* written jointly by a British and an Indian author?

Scholars were clamouring for access to the Peshwa Daftar for studying the papers and publishing them. The Government had, in the meanwhile, asked Rao Bahadur C. G. Vad to wade through the vast mass of papers and make certain portions ready for the press. The task was a little complicated; the *Modi* papers had to be deciphered and written in Devanagari before anything could be done; the dates had to be fixed and corresponding Gregorian years supplied. More difficult was the task of determining the writers and the addressees. All this was a patient and scholarly work and Vad proved quite competent. But the actual work of publishing all the papers including the learned introduction fell to the lot of Parasnis. And it must be said that he did it well. A number of scholars were associated with the editing of respective volumes, but the lion's share was taken up by Parasnis in co-operation with Purshottam Vishram Mavji. The books published through Vad's efforts were fifteen in number and curiously they came to be known as *Vad's Diaries*. Actually, they include some material which could be called diaries of the *Chhatrapatis* and the Peshwas. For bringing out these fifteen books, credit must however be given to the hard and painstaking work of Parasnis.

Parasnis thought that the Peshwa Daftar, the Manavali collection in Nana Fadnavis Wada and the collections belonging to jagirdars in the Deccan would yield a rich treasure. After securing some of the material he published it in the magazine *Itihas Sangraha* which had a career of ten years (1907 to 1916). Volumes 16, 19 and 22 of Rajwade's collection were first printed in the *Itihas Sangraha*. In the same magazine many letters of the times of Peshwa Madhav Rao I were published.

The correspondence of Ali Bahadur and the letters of Govindrao Kale, the vakeel of the Peshwas at the court of the Nizam, of Purshottam Mahadeo Hingne and Lala Sevakram (the Peshwa's vakeel with Warren

Hastings and Lord Cornwallis) are also there. He drew material of rare value from the letters of Nana Fadnavis kept in his Daftar at Manavali.

Parasnis wrote some books in English. His *Notes on Satara* and the description of *Mahabaleshwar*, *Sangli State* and *Panhala*, are small books but full of useful historical information. They are still in demand. From his *Poona in Bygone Days*, a reader can get glimpses of Poona of the early nineteenth century. *History of the Maratha People* in three volumes (1918, 1922 and 1925) is a monumental work, undertaken jointly with Charles A. Kincaid.

After collecting a large amount of historical manuscripts, papers, books and museum articles, etc., Parasnis approached the Government in 1912 for help towards establishing a historical museum at Satara. Accordingly, the Satara Historical Research Society was founded and a museum established there. The collection exhibited in the museum consisted of (1) a most valuable collection of original historical papers (about 50,000) obtained from the old Maratha families, (2) a collection of Indian paintings (Mughal, Rajput and others) and of illuminated manuscripts, many of them of great rarity and beauty, (3) a collection of correspondence of various British authorities and of autographed letters of Anglo-Indian statesmen, (4) a collection of English books relating to Indian affairs in the latter part of the eighteenth and the earlier days of the nineteenth centuries, (5) a library of more modern histories and biographies relating to India, (6) a collection of prints of Anglo-Indian statesmen, of Indian historical scenes and landscapes, (7) a small collection of miscellaneous objects of artistic or historic interest, (8) illustrated books, (9) English engravings, rare and valuable, (10) old arms and dresses, (11) old inscriptions, stones and relics, and (12) old maps. It was established at Satara and a building was specially constructed for that purpose. The collection which came into the possession of the Government actually consisted of (*a*) Marathi manuscripts, (*b*) coins, and (*c*) books.

The collection in the museum was later transferred in 1939 to the Deccan College, Poona, and is still there. It seems that part of it was retained by the family of Parasnis. The collection that has still remained with the Parasnis family of Satara contains books, paintings and the museum articles as follows:

Library books 743, Gazetteers, Encyclopaedia, Dictionaries, etc. 28, manuscripts 50, magazines on Art 21, coins (gold, silver and copper) 2280, unlisted old Indian paintings 39, illuminated books and pothies 39, curios 56, historical Marathi books and magazines 285, books on Art 159, French books on Art 20, old Indian paintings 287, engravings, portraits, views, etc. 162, historical photographs 34, English and French magazines 316.

The Marathi papers are all original and belong to the historical personages who actually took part in the Maratha politics in the eighteenth

century. They possess unique interest and form most useful material for the history of the Marathas.

There are letters and despatches of warriors and statesmen who actually made Maratha history and those written by the Peshwa's vakeels and correspondents from different courts. The letters of Madhavrao I, Raghunathrao, Nana Fadnavis, Sakharam Bapu, Haripant Phadke, Mahadji Shinde, Tukoji Holkar, Parashuram Bhau Patwardhan, Ali Bahadur, Anandrao Raste, and other notable persons fall in the first category and the letters of Purshottam Mahadeo Hingne, Govindrao Kale and others in the second. Besides, there is the correspondence of the Peshwa's representatives with the European powers, such as the British, the French and the Portuguese, which is valuable. Very few persons know that the Marathas had their vakeels at places like Calcutta, Pondicherry and Goa. Lala Sevakram, who was their vakeel with Warren Hastings and Lord Cornwallis at Calcutta, used to report to the Peshwa's minister all their movements. He has even described the duel between Warren Hastings and Francis in 1780. Janardan Shivaram was their vakeel at Pondicherry and his original letter written in English to Lord Macartney, Governor of Madras, is in this collection. He has written a most graphic account of the activities of the English and the French in Southern India, and his letters are as interesting as the Diaries of Ananda Ranga Pillai (Papi Pillai?), Dupleix's *Dubash* (interpreter), which are being translated and published by the Madras Government. Ranchod Krishna was the Peshwa's representative with the English at Bombay, and his letters about Governors Hornby, Boddam and Ramsay are full of historical interest. With the Portuguese at Goa, the Maratha vakeel was Vithal Narayan Dhume, who brought about a friendly alliance between these two powers, and the letter sent by the Governor of Goa to the Peshwa through his agent in 1774 is a valuable piece of historical relic. It will thus be seen that the information derived from this material will undoubtedly throw a new light on the Maratha connection with the European powers that played a conspicuous part in Indian history.

There is in addition a voluminous correspondence relating to the Maratha Army, Navy, Revenue, Justice, Society and Religion. There are daily accounts of this or that Court and they will surely be of great value. Graphic descriptions exist of several persons and their daily private and political life which show their mode of living, their manners and morals, their character and their cultural refinement. The private diaries of Sawai Madhavrao the Peshwa, or Sir Charles Malet, the British Envoy at the Poona Court, are striking. They give a true insight into the Poona society of the day and show the influence of the foreigner at the Maratha Court (I.H.R.C. volume of 1921).

Old Books on India: The collection of books on India include history, biography, geography, travels, antiquities, commerce, etc. It was the object of Parasnis to bring these together for reference.

Illustrated Rare Books: Many interesting and rare books are illustrated works, including valuable treatises on Indian Art. They contain fine coloured or B and W reproductions by eminent artists, such as Daniel, Colebrooke, Doyly, Frazer Hodges, Hunter and Moffat. There are also many illustrated books by French Artists.

Persian and Marathi Manuscripts: Parasnis collected many valuable Persian manuscripts, original letters and copies of the Mughal correspondence with Shivaji Maharaj and the subsequent Chhatrapatis, Shahu and Sambhaji, and the Peshwas.

English Manuscripts: The English manuscripts and autographs in the Parasnis collection are valuable. The Macartney collection, Sir Fredrick Currie collection and Grant Duff collection, are all invaluable treasures. To them may be added the original letters and accounts of Bombay by Henry Garey, Governor of Bombay (1667-68), and also original manuscripts of Captain Moor, the famous author of that rare and interesting book *The Hindu Pantheon*, the unpublished story of Cawnpore 1857 by Freeland, and the interesting diaries of Major Wilson about Delhi.

Illuminated Manuscripts: It was an outstanding achievement of Parasnis to acquire illuminated manuscripts which are the marvel of the whole collection. They are the finest specimens of the beautiful art. They are illustrated with magnificent miniatures illuminated in gold. The Persian manuscripts are written on stout paper in a beautiful nastalik character with full page illuminated Anwans, which may be reckoned among the masterpieces of Islamic art. There are specimens of beautiful calligraphy. The charming and delicate miniatures bearing traces of Mughal influence are in a fine state of preservation. The Sanskrit manuscript, *Bhagawadgita*, is a striking piece of pictorial decoration. They are delicately-executed Indian paintings of uncommon skill and the water colours look fresh. There are mythological paintings, the pictures of Ragas and Raginis, and many other subjects.

The most noteworthy manuscript is the life of the Buddha painted on *peepal*-leaves. Scenes from Buddha's life are painted by a Chinese artist. All these are nicely preserved by the Parasnis family at Satara.

Historical Portraits and Engravings: Some of the portraits are the works of well-known English artists. They are of fine mezzotint, stipple or line engravings and in some cases hand-coloured.

Historical Views and Scenes: There is another collection of paintings, engravings, prints and pictorial representations in general, both of persons and scenes, which mark the great events in Indian history; historic buildings and forts are also represented.

Along with these there are old European views depicting scenes of London, Venice, Paris, etc., which came to India in the eighteenth century and were presented to the Peshwa or the Maratha chiefs and the nobles by the British Residents. They form in themselves valuable historic pieces of art.

Historical Photographs: Parasnis had in his collection a large number of photographs of Indian dignitaries and of Indian historical places, particularly those collected by the well-known traveller Lord Brassy of the "Sun Beam" fame. Another noteworthy collection is of the reproduction of Indian historical paintings collected by Manucci in the seventeenth century which was obtained by Parasnis by special permission of the Conservateur du Departement des Estamps, Bibliothèque National, Paris. There are also various collections of photographs, chiefly of Indian princes, the Nawabs, the Rajas and Talukdars of U.P., the tour of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales (King Edward VII), the first historical Durbar of Lord Lytton (1877) and many other important events.

Maps and Plans: Parasnis has in his possession the valuable maps of Goegrapher Moll, of the United East India Company, James Rennell's map of Bengal, Bihar, Allahabad (1786) and Geographer Boltain's map of Asia including China, India (1785); Sir A. Arrowsmith's Improved Map of India, especially prepared in 1840 for the East India Company; J. Wilk's map of Hindustan or modern India 1807; Maps of India published according to the charter of Parliament by James Horsburgh, Hydrographer to the Hon. East India Company (1833).

There is another interesting series of the views of Delhi, Calcutta and Bombay, which were painted and exhibited at the Pandram of Leicester Square, London, by Burford in 1831. The view of Delhi in 1857 is most curious and considered to be an interesting relic of the Great Mughal capital of the Mutiny days. These maps are an excellent means of studying local history and topography.

There are also very rare old maps and plans of the great Western cities, London, Paris, Venice, etc.

Coins and Medals: The collection of old coins is a valuable section in the Parasnis collection. It is comparatively small in quantity (about 2000) but rich in numismatic value. It comprises ancient as well as modern coins of all Indian dynasties including some foreign nations. It represents early foreign dynasties and the Guptas, Persian, Medieval and South Indian dynasties, the Sultans of Delhi, contèmporary dynasties in India, Mughal Emperors of India, Nawabs of Lucknow, Hindu Kings of Mysore and Vijayanagar, Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan, Maratha Kings, East India Company, etc.

The Vijayanagar and Mysore series are extremely rare and valuable and some of them are actual duplicates of those types that are considered to be unique in the British Museum.

The collection also contains a large number of English medals, provincial coins and tokens, German tokens, counters, and medals and also Roman, Greek, Swiss, American, Maltese, Swedish, Portuguese, Russian, Bactrian, Indo-Scythian, and Chinese coins which are most valuable from the numismatic point of view.

Amongst the medals, there are some interesting War medals, including the Maratha medal given by the Calcutta Government in 1784 and the famous Mysore Medal of 1799, issued in honour of the great victory won over Tipu Sultan by the brave British Commandant. There is one curious Maratha medal with an authentic miniature of Sawai Madhavrao Peshwa which was presented to a Maratha Sardar for wearing it on the battle-field as an emblem of victory.

Parasnis described the collection as being of exceptional value. In the centenary celebration of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1905, Parasnis read before the History Section his paper on "Maratha Historical Literature" in which he explained his ideas about the proposed museum thus: "A museum may appropriately possess a court for history, where ancient manuscripts and documents, arms and ornaments, dresses and pictures, seals and coins, and other objects of historical interest might be collected. It will serve as a convenient resort for students of history desiring to make researches in that line. The project of a museum may, however, take a long time to accomplish. On the heels of collection of materials must follow the work of digesting and assimilating them. A race of scholars must rise, trained in the art of deciphering manuscripts, of weighing evidence and drawing inferences with discrimination."

Professor H. G. Rawlinson, Principal of the Deccan College, who examined the manuscripts in 1928, found that only a portion of the Marathi manuscripts was of value. Sir Jadunath Sarkar examined these in 1933, and found that the only valuable contents consist of Marathi historical papers, mostly post-Panipat, and unpublished letters of the early part of British Indian administration as well as prints illustrating the days of the East India Company. He found the Persian manuscripts very meagre, and this view was confirmed by Professor Shaikh who reported that they were almost worthless as several documents were unconnected with history and were even fake. The coins, the number of which has been increased by subsequent gifts, are mostly of copper and silver and were found to be of value, and the same remark applies to the Library which, according to Sir Jadunath Sarkar, contains some rare books.

VASUDEO VAMANSHASTRI KHARE

A. M. VAIRAT

(Shivaji University, Kolhapur)

THE story of the past in Marathi can be traced in the seventeenth century. The establishment of the Maratha Kingdom brought political changes in the Deccan. The changed phase was recorded in many forms, and 'bakhar' was the only form nearer to history. Bakhar, though it cannot be called a perfect historical work, is one of the most useful source-materials for Maratha history.

The credit for the methodological writing of history goes to foreign writers. Springel, a German professor, published in German his book on Maratha history in the year 1786. The book is based on English sources. He was followed by Scott Waring who wrote his *A History of the Mahrattas* in 1810. This honest work was also unable to utilise enough sources. The only book that can be called a key-book for the history of the Marathas is Grant Duff's *History of the Mahrattas* which came out in 1826. His work can be criticised on many grounds. Even then its value remains unchanged.

Duff's work was challenged in 1867 by Nilakanth Janardan Kirtane who published his famous critique—*Marathyanche Bakharivar Tika*, showing how Duff was misleading and wrong many a time. A Marathi journal, the *Kavyetihas-Sangraha-Patra-Yadi*, made its appearance in 1876 and gave ample source-material for Maratha history. It was felt necessary by this time to know the glorious past for planning the present and the future. Rajwade, a contemporary of Khare and a great scholar, impressed all by his methodology. Khare and Rajwade created an interest in research in the history of the Marathas from original documents.

Vasudeo Vamanshastri Khare was born on August 5, 1858, at Guhagar, in Ratnagiri district. Guhagar is a very nice place surrounded by mountains on three sides and the Arabian Sea on the fourth. Beautiful Nature bequeathed to Khare the heart of a poet. At the age of fourteen, when he was at Kolhapur for his education, he was given an award for a poem by Kagalkar, a jagirdar near Kolhapur. He got married in 1873 to Satyabhamabai.

His career was shaped at Satara and Poona. In Satara he got a chance to write in a weekly, the *Maharashtra-Mitra*. He improved his reading, writing, and his health too in these days. Poverty made him go to Poona to seek for service. He continued there his study of Sanskrit. This helped him to get an offer of the editorship of the Sanskrit section of the famous journal

Kavyetihas-Sangraha-Patra-Yadi in the absence of Vishnushastri Chipalunkar.

Khare came in contact with Sane, Modak, Chipalunkar, Jinsivale, Tilak and Agarkar during his stay at Poona. He worked with Tilak and Agarkar in the New English School, established in 1880. He had very close relations with Tilak. He suggested the title *Kesari* for the famous Marathi newspaper founded by Tilak. Though he did not participate personally in politics, it is well known that he backed Tilak.

In 1880 he was appointed a teacher of Sanskrit in a school at Miraj. He spent all his life there as a renowned teacher and a great scholar of history.

Poetry and drama also established the reputation of Khare in the history of Marathi literature. He published a number of poems like "Samudra", "Yashavantaraya Mahakavya", "Janmabhumi", "Gopika-baicha Putrashoka", "Ujjayani", etc. The *Yashavantaraya Mahakavya*, which had a historical background got a prize from the Dakshina Prize Committee. The book can be called one of the best poetical works in Marathi.

A competition in drama-writing was held by Rajaram College, Kolhapur, in 1884 and a prize was given to the *Gunotkarsha*, a drama by Khare. He wrote seven dramas in all. Generally, the themes are historical. *Shivasambhav*, a story of Shivaji's birth, is still popular in Maharashtra. When Tilak criticised his drama-writing as a waste of time Khare plainly told him that he wrote them to get help for his historical research and maintenance of his family.

Poetry and historical research are two quite different fields. One is romantic and heart-touching, the other prosaic and dry. Even then Khare-shastri proved to be the best combination of a poet, a dramatist and a historian.

When he was working in a section of the *Kavyetihas-Sangraha-Patra-Yadi*, he came across a vast amount of historical source-material. It delighted the historian in him. In 1892 he brought out his first historical work under the caption *Nana Phadnavisache Charitra*.

The study of historiography in India is much less developed than in the Western countries. Rajwade studied European scholars and their methods, but it was not possible for Khare to go through such ideal methodology. He adopted his own methods and came very near to modern methodologists.

Research in history and the writing of history are two separate things. Only a genius can excel in both of them. Khare's scholarship in the field of history was accepted by all contemporary scholars. Sir Jadunath Sarkar writes about him, "...Khare's most striking characteristics were his systematic arrangement, judicious spirit or strong common sense and terseness —in all of which he presents a pleasing contrast to V. K. Rajwade. His

Lekhasangraha will stand as a model for others dealing with historical archives and editors of documents. His introductions are most helpful to the reader and admirably concise and free from irrelevant digressions."[1]

The simple method that was followed by Khare can be described as Collection of documents, External and Internal Criticism, Chronology and Geography. Chronology and Geography are called the eyes of history. Khare has maintained chronology throughout his writings. He studied Geography for the minute details of topographical descriptions. He had in his collection maps of different types. He studied every document sincerely until the matter was clear. He left the doubtful places as they had been found and never tried any wrong interpretation. "Throughout history a living, active, creative and responsive soul is present at all times and places. Every first class document is an expression of such a soul."[2] Khare concentrated his mind on that soul and so confidently threw light on the documents.

In his introduction to the first volume of *Aitihasik Lekhasangraha* he writes that "bakhars and legends are of very little use for Maratha history. The history should be based on the contemporary documents like correspondence. And the task to search out these documents is very troublesome and expensive." About the undated letters he remarks: "the work of dating these letters is very difficult and can be imagined by a man who has worked in this field only."

Footnotes are necessary for a scholarly history-writing. Khareshastri's footnotes are sometimes more interesting than the original text.

His first book *Nana Phadnavisache Charitra* was very popular at that time. Nana was once a prominent figure in the Maratha State. He wisely administered the disturbed state at critical times. The book is written gracefully and Nana is shown as a hero all the time. The writer's amateurishness could not envisage the ignorance of Nana about contemporary European politics. The policies of this hero were many a time coloured with selfishness. The biography was afterwards revised by his son Yashwant Khare.

While this work was going on, Khare got some information about the Miraj daftar belonging to the Patwardhans, the Chiefs of Miraj. He was fortunate to go through the daftar which made him work for his whole life. The Patwardhans played an important role in the history of the Marathas. They being close associates and helpmates of the Peshwas, their records contain first class original material. Miraj was their centre. Sangli, Jamkhindi and Kurundwad are also the places where Patwardhan records are found. But these belong to the later period.

The Miraj daftar contains about four lakhs of letters in three hundred 'rumals'. Khareshastri selected the letters and divided them according to the dates and contents. The main subject in these letters is politics. But there are also numerous letters which reflect the social conditions of the

Maratha State. A magazine named the *Aitihasik Lekhasangraha* was started for the publication of these letters by Khare in 1897. The publication was stopped after three years. Even then he produced under his able editorship twelve volumes of *Aitihasik Lekhasangraha* in his life time. Another three volumes were published by his son.

Fifteen volumes of *Aitihasik Lekhasangraha* contain eight thousand four hundred and forty-three pages. These pages cover letters from 1739 up to the end of the Maratha rule. One important and interesting thing found in the volumes is their weighty introductions. Khare chose a group of letters and gave their detailed history as an introduction. If all the introductions are ever published together, it would be a very fine book on the post-Panipat Maratha history. A part of it was published by his son as *Miraj Prakaran*, *Hyderallivar Tisari Swari* and *Marathi Riyasaticha Uttarardha*, Part I.

In an annual function at Velas, the watan of Nana Phadnavis, Khare read a paper on how Nana got a chance as a *Karbhari*. The paper was admired and was published with some additions under the title *Adhikaryog*.

"Bakhars are generally onesided," as Khareshastri has pointed out in his introduction to *Harivanshachi Bakhar*; yet he adds that "they are useful for history if written by the men who were knowing the facts."[3] *Harivanshachi Bakhar*, according to him, was not onesided. The 'bakhar' written by Balkrishna Harihar Patwardhan was edited by Khare in 1909. It is a story of the descendants of the Patwardhans from Harbhat, and particularly Purshottamdaji is described. Most of the things are pictured as told by the old men and so are exaggerated. The description of the incident of poisoning of Anandibai cannot be trusted.[4] He has kept the grammatical mistakes as they were found so as to preserve the originality of the text.

A complete history of the Ichalkaranji State is given in his book *Ichalkaranji Sansthanacha Itihas*. It was the only state in India which was given an inam (present) and its rulers were not bound to serve anywhere. The rulers belonged to a Brahmin family, but took the name 'Ghorpade'. Ichalkaranjikar wanted to get the history of the state written by Khareshastri. Before he started his work, he warned that he would write the history as he would find it. He kept his word as is proved by his discussion of the career and character of Narayanrao Vyankatesh (1745-70)[5] and Vyankatrao Narayan II (1770-95).[6] He gave the credit for the prosperity of the state to Anubai, a daughter of Balaji Vishwanath and wife of Vyankatrao Narayan I (1716-45).

He is aware of the fact that while writing the book he has sometimes digressed from the subject. He forgets his role as a historian and writes like a poet. He has expressed views which are diametrically opposite in a few cases. He describes the rule of Jijabai, the queen of Sambhaji II of Kolhapur, as totally chaotic,[7] and at another place he praises her for the development of the state.[8] The discussion of the relations between Shahu and the Peshwa

and the general condition of the Maratha State is very important. The book is divided into two parts. One part tells the history of the state, and the other gives the original letters as its sources. Up-to-date footnotes given in the second part clear up the jumbled places.

One of the best articles that Khareshastri has produced is his introduction to the book *Marathe Va Engraj* by Narsinh Chintaman Kelkar. He differentiates in the beginning between a simple narrative history and a critical history. He demands an independent thesis on the subject.[9] The theme of his essay is to find out the reasons for the fall of the Marathas.

He points out the defects in Maratha character as follows: "The Indian in general and the Maratha in particular have no love for their nation. Anyone can rule them if they are not interfered with in their religion, traditions, 'vatan', etc."[10] He gives the examples of an English doctor and Nana Phadnavis, showing the doctor's love for his country and Nana's selfishness.[11] The comparison between the Marathas and the East India Company discloses how the Marathas were unable to work co-operatively by forming an organized body. The Marathas conquered a vast area in a shorter period than the British, but lack of discipline and internal tussles compelled them to lose it.

He concludes after a long discussion that India would have been taken definitely by the French or others had not the British occupied it.[12] The essay is the fruit of his life-long study in history.

His book *Maloji Shahaji* was published in the year 1920. The book gives the biographies of Maloji and Shahaji. Khareshastri has tried to prove how Shahaji was one of the main causes of the rise of Shivaji. Shivaji was born, according to him, in the year 1630.[13] He has produced interesting points regarding the seal of Shivaji. What was the necessity of such a separate seal? Shahaji definitely had some ideas in his mind about Shivaji's independent rule.[14]

Grant Duff was criticised by Khare in a series of articles "Grant Duffcha Chukanche Hapte", published in an English paper, the *Maratha*, in 1915. He praises Duff for his spirit of research. The mistakes are pointed out to avoid the misunderstanding of history. He has referred to Duff throughout his work.

Another series under the title "Prof. Latthe ani Parshurambhaunchi Chhatri", was once upon a time a matter of discussion in Maharashtra. Latthe published a studied article in the *Manoranjan*[15] about the battle of Pattankudi between Shivaji III, Chhatrapati of Kolhapur, and Parshurambhau Patwardhan (1799). Khare replied to him through the above-mentioned series published in the *Dnyanprakasha*,[16] criticising Latthe very strongly.

It was granted by Khare that Bhau was killed by the Chhatrapati of Kolhapur when he was caught wounded. A life-long study of the Patwardhan records influenced Khare to become a little partial towards them.

The letters in his *Aitihasik Lekhasangraha* prove that the battle of Pattankudi was straightaway won by Kolhapurkar and Bhau died in the crisis and was not killed.

A research paper entitled "Chalu Bhashetil Aitihasik Shabda" was given by him in the *Shashtha-Sammelan Vritta* of Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal, Poona. He has given some words and their different meanings with the original one. The first twenty-five words are based on a word *ghoda* (horse).[17] He expects research of that type from other scholars.

He was a good speaker. His lectures at Velas, Satara, Sangli and Miraj were admired by all. Some of his stray writings are not yet published.

He went on writing till the end of his life. In his last days he was worried about his uncompleted work. The description of how he worked for fifteen days before his death is given by his son in the introduction to the twelfth volume of the *Aitihasik Lekhasangraha*. He was physically so weak that he was unable to sit without supports. He worked for hours together in such an awkward position. He died on 11 June 1924, at the age of sixty-six at Miraj.

His success can be judged by the fact that he was the only Marathi historian who was criticised very little. He had no fanciful theories like Rajwade but his methods were appreciated by all.

History is not a static subject. It is bound to alter its ideals and aims with the general progress of society and of the social sciences. Theories may be changed; methods may be refined, but Khareshastri's herculean task will be admired at all times.

REFERENCES

(The quotations from Khare's books are translated into English.)

1. Sarkar, Sir Jadunath, *House of Shivaji*, 1940, p. 278.
2. Rickman, H. P. (ed.), *Meaning of History*, 1961, p. 67.
3. Khare, Vasudeo Vamanshastri, *Harivanshachi Bakhar*, 1909, p. 2.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
5. Khare, Vasudeo Vamanshastri, *Ichalkaranji Sansthanacha Itihas*, 1913, p. 48.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
9. Khare, Vasudeo Vamanshastri, *Miraj Vidyarthi Sangh Granthmala* 1 (original book *Marathe Va Engraj*, by N. C. Kelkar, 1918), 1957, p. 11.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
13. Khare, Vasudeo Vamanshastri, *Maloji Va Shahaji*, 1920, p. 12.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
15. *Manoranjan*, May 1914.
16. *Dnyanprakash*, November and December, 1914.
17. Potdar and Muzumdar, *Shashtha-Sammelan Vritta*, 1918, pp. 67-68.

GOVIND SAKHARAM SARDESAI

DR. VASANT D. RAO

(Shivaji University, Kolhapur)

PRESIDING over the fourteenth session of the Indian History Congress held at Jaipur in 1951, Riyasatkar Padmabhushan Govind Sakharam Sardesai said, "I have never aspired for the limelight or worldly dignities. Since my early days I have confined my labour and attention to a limited field without any larger ambitions. I have all along been a very fortunate person in having gained special facilities for study and travel in Europe and India during my long career of service in Baroda and in my present retirement at Kamshet. I thank Providence still more for the health and activity which I fortunately retain even at this age. I have ever regretted my ignorance of Persian which I could not make up in later life. English, Sanskrit and Persian are altogether essential as a necessary equipment for those who have to handle the subject of Indian history."

In this succinct manner Sardesai has summarised his position in life. It is true that in his early life he did not aim to be a historian. After getting his bachelor's degree in Arts, he was in search of a job. A well-wisher took him to Sayajirao Gaekwad to act as a reader for the latter. Sayajirao soon appointed him as a tutor to his children. Industrious as Sardesai was, he took pains to prepare notes to teach his students. He drew up copious notes on Indian history for them. These notes were the basis of his books—well known in Maharashtra as 'Riyasats'. They made him a historian and gave him the popular epithet of 'Riyasatkar'.

'A historian by accident' has been the epithet given to Sardesai by some people. Of the Maratha historians he was the one who lived longest. He spent his long life entirely in the study of history. Though the peculiar nature of his job made him prepare notes on history, yet, once he took to studying history, he made a thorough job of his work. It must be remembered that as a teacher to the Baroda Princes he must have taught them a number of subjects besides history. A painstaking person as Sardesai was, he must have prepared notes on geography, Marathi and English literature and so on. If merely preparing of notes was the cause of his being a historian, he could as well have been a geographer or a Marathi and/or English litterateur. I therefore maintain that an innate love of history must be accepted as the underlying cause of his huge production in the field of history.

Sardesai was born at his maternal grandfather's place at Hasol (District Ratnagiri, Maharashtra State) on May 17, 1865. The family surname

was Mavalankar. *Sardesai* was the office held by his ancestors. The family hails from Mavalanga (District Ratnagiri). Its history for the last seven hundred years is traceable.[1] As the story goes, Sambhaji was captured at Sangameshwar in the family residence of the Sardesais.[2] His father moved to Govil (District Ratnagiri). Sardesai was his eldest son. He had to spend his childhood in hardship. He had to look after the family cattle. As he has described in his autobiography, Govil was a place far removed from the city life. Its people had not seen a match-box or a newspaper. At the age of seven Sardesai was sent to a village school at Veravali. After a year he was moved to a bigger school at Shiposhi. Here he lived as a boarder with the Athale family. In 1879 he moved to the Ratnagiri High School from where he passed the Matriculation examination in 1884. While yet in the high school he was married to Gangubai, the daughter of Moro Vinayak Kirtane, a teacher in the same school.

His father-in-law agreed to bear the expenses of his college education. Sardesai went to his place in Poona and was enrolled in the Fergusson College. The next year he joined the Elphinstone College, Bombay, wherefrom he passed the B.A. examination in 1888. While in Bombay he lived at the residence of Bapusaheb Athale. This association proved to be very beneficial to Sardesai. By the time he appeared for his B.A., Maharaj Sayajirao Gaekwad had asked Bapusaheb Athale to recommend a young man to be his reader and personal clerk. Bapusaheb recommended Sardesai who joined the Baroda service on January 1, 1889.

From 1889 to his retirement in 1925 he served the Baroda State, first as a reader to his Highness, then as a tutor to the royal princes, and finally as the officer in charge of the Maharaja's personal accounts. Being the personal clerk of the ruler, he got the opportunity of touring all over India with the Maharaja. Four times he accompanied Sayajirao on his European tours. These travels broadened his horizons, and he met a large number of Indians and Europeans whose company proved very profitable.

His first son was born on May 5, 1899, and the second on February 27, 1903. But both his sons died young. In 1943 his life's companion left this world.

Sayajirao was a very hard taskmaster. He noted that his reader had work which would keep him busy only for a couple of hours in a day. He, therefore, asked Sardesai to translate into Marathi Machiavelli's *Prince* and Seeley's *Expansion of England*. Sardesai dared not refuse. Up to this time he had not written anything either in Marathi or in English. He took some time but the Maharaja was after him. Ultimately he rendered *The Prince* in Marathi as *Rajdharma* (1890) and *Expansion of England* as *England Deshacha Vistar* (1893). Both these books were published at the state cost. It may incidentally be mentioned that Sardesai was fortunate enough to present personally *England Deshacha Vistar* to Seeley.

Soon Sayajirao asked Sardesai to teach his son Fattesing. Thus began

Sardesai's career as the tutor of the royal students. Within a short time, a school for princes was started. Sardesai was in overall charge of the school.

For teaching history to his students he started writing down the entire story in Marathi. His friend Rambhau Tikekar read his writings and handed them over to Damodar Savalaram Yande, the editor of the *Sayaji Vijay*, who decided to publish them in a book form. Sardesai came to know about it when he received the first proof. He was astonished and resented the action. But the die was cast. In 1898 came out the first volume of the *Masalmani Riyasat* (from the Muslim conquest to 1526). The very year also saw the publication of the second volume of the *Masalmani Riyasat* (1526-1803).

But his greatest achievement is his series of books on Maratha history known as *Marathi Riyasat*. These books earned for him the popular title of 'Riyasatkar'. He wrote the entire history of the Marathas from the beginning till 1848 in eight volumes. He was doing this work for over thirty years from 1902. The *Marathi Riyasat* was divided into three parts. First, *Purva Vibhag* up to 1707 (one volume), the second, *Madhya Vibhag* from 1707 to 1774 (four volumes) and the third, *Uttar Vibhag* from 1774 to 1848 (three volumes). For the first part he wrote about 600 pages and for the second and the third approximately 1700 and 1500 pages respectively.

For this gigantic task he read on a vast scale. From the pages of the *Riyasat*, we could clearly see that he had very carefully gone through the immense source-material published by Sane, Rajwade, Khare and Parasnis. Their books are a storehouse of information about the activities of the Marathas. The books contain contemporary documents. Special mention must be made of the letters written by the diplomatic representatives at far away places like Maheshwar, Hyderabad, Orissa, Bengal, Punjab, Pondicherry, etc. to the Peshwa at Poona. To read this vast store of documents was not an easy matter. To read and digest them and to take down important points was a still more difficult task. Sardesai undertook and carried out this stupendous task with great success. It is not possible for every student of Maratha history to read all these documents. Sardesai has placed him under an obligation by using these documents in his *Riyasats*. A student of Maratha history has first to read his books and then take the next step. Before Sardesai there was no history of the Marathas written in Marathi with such thoroughness.

It was he who first brought to the notice of the reading public the exploits of Shivaji and Sambhaji, of Santaji and Dhanaji and of Bajirao and Mahadaji. These figures are yet the idols of the Marathas. Their names have a hypnotic effect on the Maratha mind. Sardesai was the first and is till today the only one who has written a continuous history of the Marathas from the early life of Shahaji till the end of the state of Satara.

This herculean task was followed by two volumes of *British Riyasat*. The first volume (1923) covers the period from 1600 to 1757 and the second (1939) from 1757 to 1858.

The *Riyasats* contain vast information. At a number of places Sardesai refers to the sources, but he does not analyse the reliability or otherwise of the sources. He does not take into consideration the time when a letter was written, neither the place from where it was written. If he were to give attention to these details he would have given a better judged history. He writes about Shivaji and the other heroes of Maratha history, but rarely undertakes the task of evaluating their contribution. In his *Shakakarta Shivaji* he compares Shivaji with Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon and others but the comparisons do not show a well thought-out estimate. In his *Ugra-prakriti Sambhaji*, it seems that he is making a conscious effort to avoid the assessment of Sambhaji. The same thing may be noted about Shahu, Rajaram, Bajirao, Nana Phadnis and Mahadji Shinde.

Perhaps this may be due to the fact that while in the service of the Baroda state, he never got the necessary composure of mind for a scholarly appreciation of men and events. He had to work right from daybreak to at times midnight. In the court atmosphere of jealousy and hatred, of heart-burning and backbiting, there was hardly any scope to sit quietly and make a careful evaluation of the contributions of the people about whom he was writing. At some places in the *Riyasats* he has attempted to assess the contributions of certain historical figures. For example, he has written a chapter on the *yogyata* (estimate) of Peshwa Balaji Bajirao. He also writes about *mrityu* and *yogyata* of Peshwa Madhavrao. He makes a stray reference about Nana Phadnis's place in history. But all these attempts seem to be half-hearted. He believes more in citing the opinions of others rather than giving his own opinion.

Right from the beginning he writes in a very readable style. Each chapter is given a title which is very apt and meaningful of its contents. The paragraphs of a particular chapter are often introduced by expressive sub-titles. While revising his *Marathi Riyasat* for the third edition he divided it into reign-wise books. They may be noted for their well-fitting captions: *Raje Shahaji* (Shahaji Raja), *Shakakarta Shivaji* (Shivaji, the epoch-maker), *Ugraprakriti Sambhaji* (Sambhaji, the violent), *Sthirbuddhi Rajaram* (Rajaram, the stable-minded), *Punyashlok Shahu* (Shahu, the pious), etc. In this edition he has also turned to ornamental language. The career of Shivaji has been divided into ten parts which make very fine reading. I quote them below: *Mavalatil Bachha* (A boy from Maval), *Deshamukhancha Pudhari* (A leader of the Deshmukhs), *Swarajyacha Bhikshekari* (A mendicant for self-rule), *Swatantracha Kaiwari* (A champion of independence), *Swadharmacha Sevak* (A servant of religion), *Maharashtracha Niyanta* (The ruler of Maharashtra), *Sarvabhoumacha Uchachhedak* (The challenger of the emperor), *Swadeshacha*

Uddharak (The saviour of his nation), *Sinhasanadhishwar* (The enthroned monarch), *Hindupadpatshahicha Nirmata* (The creator of the Hindu empire).

Before we consider other aspects of Sardesai's historiography we must mention the lifelong friendship between Sir Jadunath Sarkar and Sardesai. Sir Jadunath was a worker in the same field. He had a keen acumen for research, and it would be difficult to find another person who had, like him, made it a point to collect all the source-materials before writing his history. Sarkar was not only keen on collecting source-material but was also endowed with a keen intellect to analyse the same. Because of their common objective they came in contact with each other. Their correspondence dates from 1904 but they met each other in 1909 at Baroda. Since then till his death in 1958 Sarkar was the only friend, philosopher and guide of Sardesai. Their friendship was cemented by the common opposition offered to them by the Bharat Itihas Samshodhak Mandal, Poona. More about this we will see in the Peshwa Daftar controversy.

While Sarkar was at Patna, he recommended Sardesai's name for a series of lectures on Maratha history. Even before the University authorities accepted the proposal, Sarkar wrote to Sardesai (24 February, 1926) asking him to prepare six or seven lectures on Maratha history. He advised him to select important topics, important personalities and also to deal with the progress of research in the field. Sardesai delivered seven lectures in all. In the first he explained *Maharashtradharma*. In the second he made a survey of the historical research in Maharashtra. In the third he discussed the objectives of Shivaji and also gave information about *Chauth, Sardeshmukhi*, etc. The expansion of the Maratha power was the theme of the fourth lecture, while the clash with the Muslim rulers was the subject of the fifth. The sixth lecture was entirely devoted to the relation between Nana and Mahadji. He discussed the causes of the fall of the Maratha power in the seventh lecture. In his introductory talk he acknowledged his limitations and declared that his aim was to remove the misconceptions created about the Marathas by the western authors. The lectures were published in a book form under the title *Main Currents of Maratha History*. Sarkar saw the book through the press.

Thus, because of his friendship with Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Sardesai got a chance to address himself to a wider group of people. Hitherto his writing was only in Marathi. Now he could place before the non-Marathi people information about the Marathas based on the original sources.

The third birth centenary of Shivaji was celebrated in 1927. On this occasion Sardesai edited *The Shivaji Souvenir* which contained articles in Marathi, Gujarati, Hindi and English. He also took part in the controversy about Shivaji's birth-date. He favoured the old date, i.e. April 6, 1627.

In 1925 Sardesai retired from the Baroda service and made Kamshet (about 30 miles to the north of Poona) his place of permanent residence. Being free from the court life and the burdens of his official duties, he could devote his entire attention to the subject of his choice. Within a short time he proved his ability for higher research. Sir Jadunath, with his intense love for historical research, was bent upon using Sardesai's energy for a monumental task. This brings us to the publication of the *Peshwa Daftar*.

With the transfer of power from the Peshwa to the East India Company, the Company got possession of the entire state-papers of the Peshwas. These papers are bound in *rumal* (kerchief). There are in all 34,972 bundles. Of these the Marathi bundles number 27,332; the English 7,482; the Persian 29 and the Gujarati 129. The Marathi papers are in *Modi* script. These documents were sealed letters for a number of years. Justice Ranade knew of their importance. Because of his efforts the Government allowed Raobahadur Ganesh Chimnaji Vad and Raobahadur D. B. Parasnis to peruse the papers. Vad perused a large number of papers and selected some of them to be published in thirty-two volumes. He died before they could be published. But before his death he had shown the papers to Justice Ranade who wrote a weighty introduction for the same. Of these, fifteen volumes were published by the Deccan Vernacular Society, Poona. Different volumes were edited by different editors including Mavji and Parasnis. The publication ceased in 1914. The diaries, as they are called, contain information about various aspects of social and political life.

Sir Jadunath knew the value of this material. At the 1929 Gwalior session of the Indian Historical Records Commission, he proposed that the Peshwa Daftar at Poona should be ransacked by competent scholars. Fortunately, the Government of Bombay accepted the suggestion and, at the instance of Sir Jadunath, appointed Sardesai as the Chief Editor. Professor K. P. Kulkarni, M. V. Gujar, V. G. Dighe and Y. N. Kelkar were appointed as his assistants. The appointment of Sardesai switched on a bitter controversy, a reference to which must be made in this paper.

The Poona School had so far refused to accept Sardesai as a research scholar. They always called him a *Sankalankar*, i.e. a compiler. Between Sir Jadunath and the Poona School no love was lost. Since the publication of Sarkar's *Shivaji* he was severely attacked by these people. They claimed that as Sarkar did not know *Modi*, he was not competent to write anything about the Marathas. Moreover, they even doubted his knowledge of Marathi. To make matters worse, Sarkar referred to Shivaji as 'Shiva' in his book. The Maharashtrians, to whom Shivaji is a magic word, looked upon this as a direct affront to them. Again, Sarkar's bias against the Brahmins was well known.

As Sarkar and Sardesai were the principal figures in the proposed publication of the Peshwa Daftar, the opposition of the Poona School was more personal than objective. They did not regard Sardesai as a historian.

Some of them took a peculiar pleasure in calling him a story-writer. On the other hand, Sarkar described Sardesai as the greatest living Maratha historian. Naturally, Sardesai felt a deep attachment for Sarkar. The intimate friendship of the two was destined to produce material that is very helpful to the research students in Maratha history.

To show that their opposition was not personal, a suggestion was made that instead of publishing selected documents from the Peshwa Daftar, a complete calendar or handlist or catalogue should first be prepared. The critics forgot that Sarkar and Sardesai wanted some material to be made available to the student of history. From a calendar or a handlist or a catalogue a student would merely know that a paper which might be useful to him is in the Daftar. Then he has to go there, find out the paper, decipher the *Modi* script and then use it for his research. On the contrary, the publication of forty-five volumes of the documents has to a great extent lightened the task of a historian.

The opposition was then taken to the floor of the Bombay Legislative Council. On March 13, 1930, some pointed questions were asked in the Council. The questions were put by Sardar G. N. Muzumdar, Raobahadur S. K. Bole and Narayanrao Gunjal. As they were not quite sure of their capacity to ask supplementary questions in English to an Englishman sitting before them, they took care to ask detailed original questions. A few may be quoted here. Sardesai's experience in research was questioned. It was alleged that his "story books" were written by someone else and published in Sardesai's name. A reference was made to the cut in his pension and it was insinuated that this was done because of his lack of integrity. They also charged him with collecting the material from the Peshwa Daftar only for his "story books". The whole incident is a sorry episode in the annals of historical research in Maharashtra. The questioners got the replies they deserved, but their questions exposed their petty-mindedness.[3]

In the whole controversy the BISM was unfortunately unnecessarily involved. Perhaps this was because of the intimate connection between Sardar Muzumdar and the Mandal. It may also be due to the fact that Professor Datto Vaman Potdar was refused "general permission" to see the Daftar.[4] Muzumdar and Potdar were the secretaries of the Mandal at this time.

Sardesai and his colleagues went through a vast mass of papers and selected some of them for publication. The selected papers were classified and rearranged. They were arranged in a chronological order and published subjectwise. To each volume Sardesai prefixed a small introduction. These introductions compare very poorly with the erudite introduction of Rajwade. Sardesai does not even introduce the volume completely. In addition, there are a number of mistakes in regard to dates which perhaps may be due to the hurry with which the work was done.

Immediately after the publication of the *Peshwa Daftar*, Sarkar and

Sardesai jointly undertook the work of editing the *Poona Residency Correspondence*. As this is entirely in English, the Government tried to engage an English lady to supervise the work. Sir Jadunath stubbornly refused to accept any such interference. The correspondence was published in fifteen volumes, out of which Sardesai edited the volumes numbering 2, 6, 7, 12 and 13. In addition, two volumes of Persian documents were also published. These are entitled the *Marathi Itihasache Farsi Sahitya*—vol. I *Dillitale Rajkaran* (1761-88); vol. II *Sinde: Dillitale Vakil* (1787; 1789-91). In the first volume ninety-nine Persian letters are translated into English, and in the second thirty-three. Both the volumes are edited by Sir Jadunath.

The Sarkar-Sardesai combination thus gave sixty-two volumes of original documents to the students of Maratha history. In the forty-five volumes of the *Peshwa Daftar* 8,650 papers covering 7,801 pages have been published, while the *Poona Residency Correspondence* has given 4,159 letters in 7,193 pages.

The correspondence between Sarkar and Sardesai covered half a century and more. It is an object lesson in how historical research could be carried on by correspondence. Sarkar inquires about the exact topographical position of certain villages in Maharashtra, referred to in Maratha history. Sardesai gives him the location. Sardesai makes similar inquiries and gets satisfactory replies. In a letter Sarkar inquires about the exact identification of Hari Pandit and Balu Mirza. Sardesai in reply tells him that Hari Pandit was Haripant Phadke, the right-hand man of Nana, and Balu Mirza was Balobatatya Pagnis, the chief adviser of Daulatrao Shinde. Sarkar doubted whether the Marathas had really been as far north as Peshawar. Sardesai gives him sufficient evidence to prove that the Marathas did go up to Peshawar. Sarkar accepts the fact. Sardesai also had supplied information to Sarkar about the inscription on the walls of the Brihadishwar temple, Tanjore. The two together have discussed and settled a number of knotty points about places, dates and individuals in the Maratha history. Even for editing the *Peshwa Daftar* Sarkar gave detailed instructions through his letters.[5]

In spite of this, one need not feel that both Sarkar and Sardesai always had the same view-point. With the same data they differ, and differ widely. About the place of Ahilyabai Holkar, they hold diametrically opposite views. Sardesai accuses Ahilyabai of wasting crores of rupees in charity, an amount which could have been used for modernising the Maratha army. Sarkar, on the other hand, believes that Mahadji Shinde could achieve wonders in the north mainly because of the backing of Ahilyabai.[6]

While he was about to complete eighty years of useful life, Sardesai undertook the writing of his *magnum-opus*, *The New History of the Marathas*. The history of the Marathas given in eight volumes of the *Marathi Riyasat* is condensed here in three volumes in English. Patient work for about half a

century now bore its fruit. His angle had also changed to an extent. In a letter to Sarkar he wrote, "Till now I proceeded on the idea that I was to point out the good or the bright side of the picture, as the western writers had sufficiently described the dark side. I will now allow documents to speak rather than impose my views upon the readers."[7]

In his introduction to the first volume of this book, he has explained the reasons which prompted him to undertake the work of writing a history of the Marathas in English. He writes, "An extreme form of national pride had hitherto kept our modern Maratha historical workers back from using the English language, which is the only medium that can reach all parts of India and also make their researches available to the civilized world in general. The most glaring example of this mental attitude was the great explorer and life-long devotee of the muse of history in Maharashtra, the late Vishwanath Kashinath Rajwade. Had he and other workers of his school published the results of their investigations in English, instead of exclusively in Marathi, they would have reached students of history all over India and enabled Maratha history to become a fruitful subject of higher study and criticism in our Indian Universities, and thus speeded up a healthy advance in our knowledge of this subject. Rajwade's scholarly dissertations on various historical topics, his illuminating discussions of problems of philology, grammar and religion, as also the researches of the Poona Itihas Samshodhak Mandal have for this reason remained a sealed book to all other provinces of India and indeed to the rest of the non -Marathi world."

He quotes the words of Professor Goldwin Smith to state why he thought it to be his duty to write a history of the Marathas. Professor Smith states, "Each nation in the main writes its own history best; it best knows its own land, its own institutions, the relative importance of its own events, the characters of its own great men. Each nation has also its peculiarities of view, its prejudices, its self-love, which require to be corrected by the impartial or even hostile view of others." Agreeing with Smith, Sardesai thought that he was called upon to make "the first attempt to present a fresh and full treatment of Maratha history in English, embodying the results of the latest research." He was himself aware of his shortcomings. He did not claim his work to be of 'ideal merits'. He only hoped that if his work encouraged further study and rethinking "in any corner of the great republic of letters, I shall be happy. And I shall be happier still if after a look at my book, some better gifted scholar is tempted to advance this subject, handle the enormous mass of materials and produce the long sighed for masterly History of the Marathas."

There was one more motive lurking in his mind which prompted him to undertake this work. He knew that "the Marathas have long been misjudged by their rivals and adversaries and painted in blackest colours both during and after the period of their downfall, as if they had no single good

point to their credit." He thought that he could hold a brief for his people. He was of course aware that it was "a difficult task for a Maratha writer to paint his people's history on a canvas with colours that truly represent facts and avoid prejudices." He, therefore, aspired "to produce a true apologia (*kaifiat*) of the Maratha people and place it before the impartial public."

In the third and the last volume of *The New History of the Marathas* he gives his farewell message: "My aim has been...to pour out to the sympathetic reader all that an ordinary son of Maharashtra has thought and felt, as he studied and pondered on the past stories of his country during his life of more than four score years. In spite of the long list of my historical works, I do not claim to be a scholar or even a trained historian, but only an eager, tireless worker. Call this my final work, the table talk of an ardent seeker after knowledge."

Knowing fully well the importance of original documents for research in history, he tried to make available such papers to the students. In collaboration with T. S. Shejvalkar, D. V. Apate and V. S. Vakaskar, he brought out a volume of source material under the caption *Marathyanchya Itihasache Sahitya* in 1924. The next year he compiled an index of the necessary topics for historical research. Its title was *Aitihasik Vishayanchi Suchi*. The *Kavyetihas Samgraha* was an old journal devoted to the publication of original documents concerning the history of the Marathas. It was started in 1878, but it soon ceased publication. During its short lifetime the journal had published valuable material. Its issues were not available. Sardesai, therefore, jointly with V. S. Vakaskar and Y. M. Kale, prepared a compendium of the very important documents published in the journal and published it with the title *Kavyetihas Samgrahat Prasiddha Zalele Aitihasik Patre Tadi Vagaire Lekh* in 1930. In 1933 he brought out the *Aitihasik Patravyavara*. This volume of historical correspondence was edited by him jointly with K. P. Kulkarni and Y. M. Kale.

Vishnu Sitaram Chitale, an energetic worker in the field of research, was working on a plan of preparing the genealogies of the leading Maratha families. He came to Sardesai for help and guidance. Always ready to help willing workers, Sardesai plunged into the project. The two together brought out a volume of historical genealogies.

For his histories Sardesai read everything that was written about the Marathas in English and in Marathi. From Sir Jadunath he got material available in the Persian sources. Sir Jadunath also helped him with other foreign sources. But there is scarcely any evidence of his having read books in auxiliary social sciences like political science, economics and sociology. In the three volumes of *The New History of the Marathas*, there is not a single line about the social history of Maharashtra of the period. He does not seem to be interested even in the methodology of history. He went on writing as he collected material. In the light of the new sources, he revised

his books for the later editions. But the flash of style which is a pleasing feature of Sarkar's writing is not so well reflected in the books of Sardesai. He was himself conscious of this. In one of his letters to Sir Jadunath, he requests him to recommend books to increase his English vocabulary. Sarkar advised him to read standard English texts loudly to himself. I have seen him revising his draft twice or thrice to polish his language. A regular reader of the *Modern Review* and such other journals, he kept himself abreast of the researches in Maratha history. Yet he does not seem to have been very much interested in the study of world history.

Sardesai was fortunate enough to get recognition both from the people and from the Government. While the work of editing and publishing the *Peshwa Daftar* was going on, the Government conferred upon him the title of 'Rao Saheb'. Five years later, after the completion of the publication of the forty-five volumes of the *Daftar*, he was elevated to be a Rao Bahadur. Not only our foreign rulers but also our own Government recognised his merit. In 1957 the Indian Union awarded him the coveted title of Padmabhushan.

He had done a great service to the Bhonsle family by writing their history. The scion of the family did not forget him. The Satara Raja invited him to his palace in 1937 and bestowed upon him the honour of *Sadetin vastre* (three and a half garments). The Raja was followed by his Sachiva. In 1952, the Sachiva of Bhora presented him a *Mahavastra* (the great garment).

The worshippers of Clio followed suit. The Rajwade Samshodhan Mandal of Dhule gave him the title of *Itihas Martand* (the Sun of History) at a special function held in his honour in 1946. The votaries of Saraswati were not slow in honouring the great savant. In 1957 the University of Poona gave him a Doctorate Honoris Causa.

In the Darbar of Sharada, a commemoration volume in the name of an individual is looked upon as the greatest honour. At the instance of Sir Jadunath, S. R. Tikekar edited a *Sardesai Commemoration Volume* and a *Sardesai Smarak Granth* in 1938. Immediately after the publication of these two volumes at the hands of the Rt. Hon'ble Dr. M. R. Jaykar, a grand Seminar was held at Kamshet at the Ashram of Sardesai on the banks of the Indrayani. History scholars from all over India, headed by Sir Jadunath Sarkar, met together for a week and discussed various problems concerning history. For a whole week, from morning to evening, various historical problems were discussed and debated. It was a unique banquet for the students of history.

The highest honour coveted by any student of Indian history is the General Presidentship of the Indian History Congress. Sardesai was accorded this honour at the fourteenth session of the Indian History Congress held at Jaipur in 1951.

After completing ninety, Sardesai wrote his autobiography under the

caption *Mazi Sansar Yatra* (1956). Naturally, one would expect the book to give details about his history-writing for over three score years. But on reading the book one is sadly disappointed. He writes about his early life, his experiences at Baroda, his family life, a few pages about the correspondence that he had with a few notable individuals, and in the end he has given an account of the different celebrations held in his honour. One cannot understand why he does not touch upon the 'history' of his history-writing. Fifty years of friendship with a personality like Sir Jadunath Sarkar was sufficient for a graphic account of the work done together by the two savants.

It adds to his stature to note that in his autobiography he does not refer at all to the ugly controversy about the *Peshwa Daftar*. In spite of the unfair manner in which Sayajirao treated him during the last days of his service, he always had a very high regard for his master. He has dedicated his *New History of the Marathas* to Sayajirao.

An account of the historiography of Sardesai will not be complete without a reference to the devoted loyalty of his trusted lieutenant Dr. V. G. Dighe. Since the days of the Peshwa Daftar, Dighe was a constant companion of Sardesai. He helped him in many ways. He edited volume IV of the *Poona Residency Correspondence* under Sardesai's guidance. He also did the indexing for Sardesai's books.

Sarkar was the only friend of Sardesai. In the later years he was very much influenced by Sarkar, though of course his conclusions were his own. He would consult Sarkar for services and also for style. At a time when the Poona School was calling him a compiler, Sarkar called him the greatest Maratha historian living. This encouragement was certainly necessary. It did a lot of good to Sardesai. Sarkar helped him with books, bought for him books at a cheap rate and recommended what books he should read. It was because of Sarkar that he got the work of editing the *Peshwa Daftar*. In return, Sardesai helped Sarkar with source material for the history of the Marathas, took him round in Maharashtra to see the historical places for himself, fixed the topographical locations of places referred to in history. Both of them were great historians in their own right. But their combination made them greater still. The Sarkar-Sardesai friendship proved to be a boon for the study of the history of the Marathas.

Sardesai is the first and, it would not be wrong to say, the only Marathi writer who has given us a cogent history of the Marathas. He has paved the path for posterity to follow.

REFERENCES

1. Vaman Narhar Sardesai, *Mavalankar-Sardesai Gharanyacha Itihas* (Poona).
2. V. S. Bendre, *Chhatrapati Sambhaji* (Bombay), pp. 608-09.
3. *Report of the Bombay Legislative Council*, vol. XXVIII, pp. 1317-24, 1475-78, 1577-95.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 1592.
5. Tikekar, *Sarkar ani Sardesai*, pp. 54-59.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.
7. Tikekar, *On Historiography*, p. 35.

SYAD MUHAMMAD LATIF

DR. S. K. BAJAJ

(Punjabi University, Patiala)

COLLINGWOOD's view that historical knowledge consists in "the historian's re-enactment in his own mind of the thought which underlay past actions",[1] amply demonstrates that history is a mental reflection of human actions or in other words, "behaviour informed by thought."[2] Historians have tried to state past reality in terms of certainty but what they have been able to achieve is that they wrote nothing more than mere impression of it. This applies also to Syad Muhammad Latif to whom, however, "the great end of history is the exact illustration of events as they occurred, and there should neither be exaggeration nor concealment, to suit angry feelings or personal disappointment."[3] Quoting from Gurwood's famous work, the *Despatches of the Duke of Wellington*, to strengthen his belief, he further adds, "History should contain the truth, the whole truth and nothing but truth."[4] Closely following Ranke's theory of history,[5] Latif tried to be critical, to be colourless and to be new. His writings were critical and new but not colourless, although it is impossible for any individual to avoid personal ingredient in his writings, more so for an administrator. Derrett's simple observation is significant to note in this connection. He observes, "Administrators, as a class, have made a marked contribution to historical writing, as indeed to history itself, and it has not proved difficult to expose their principal bias, induced by their connection with the Government and the predispositions and tastes of their English public."[6]

The Punjab, like other major provinces of India, received the attention of European scholars, generally officials, because of crucial political developments before and after the annexation in 1849. Historical literature on the Punjab boldly synchronises with the political development in the Punjab. The first attempt was that of Malcolm dictated by the contemporary political obligation of knowing and appreciating the history of the Sikh State to win over Ranjit Singh to their side.[7] On 19 March, 1849, there appeared another important book, *History of the Sikhs*, by Joseph Davey Cunningham. Besides being an indictment against the policy of Lord Hardinge, the book was intended to stimulate change in the Punjab policy of the Government.[8] Turn of the last century witnessed another publication by General Sir John J. H. Gordon, which if studied in the background of the national struggle for independence, convincingly conveys that it, by its conclusions, suggested to placate political support of the Sikhs, a religious minority, to the Government to operate as a lever against the Indian

National Congress.[9] Interesting enough, that in the list a few persons whom Gordon acknowledges, the name of Syad Muhammad Latif also appears.

Though an obscure figure amongst the nineteenth century historians, the study of Syad Muhammad Latif is very fascinating for various reasons. Neither a professional nor a philosophic historian, which in fact few were in the last century, Latif was a revenue official, first among Indians to write a comprehensive history of the Punjab in English. Like most of his contemporary English-educated Indian Officials, he was liberal and well aware of the movement modernising Indian communities, and like all Muslims of his caste, he traced his genealogy back to Prophet Mohammad. He was not a fanatic Muslim. As a historian, he is generally believed to be appreciative of the Gurus.[10] However, it may be noted that by profession, an administrator, he could not ignore his obligation to the agency of which he was an employee. As an individual and a member of backward community as compared to the Hindus, he could not but feel his responsibility to assist his brethren in the struggle for identity led by Sir Syad Ahmed. Working under the pressure of these two major realities, he through his writings, made them complementary to each other.

Syad Muhammad Latif was born in 1847[11] about two years before the annexation of the Punjab. Born under the shadows of grim struggle in Punjab, he was destined to justify and support the British rule in the Punjab. He belonged to the esteemed Syad community, supposed to be the highest in the social strata of the Indian Muslims. After having received a liberal education, he was appointed as Extra-Judicial Assistant Commissioner on a salary of five hundred rupees.[12] In 1892 and 1897, he was conferred titles of *Khan Bahadur*,[13] and *Shams-ul-Ulema*[14] respectively for his meritorious services. For short periods twice he acted as the Divisional Judge of Lahore and Hoshiarpur.[15] He held the post till the beginning of 1901 and worked at almost all the important places of the Punjab, viz., Lahore, Jullundur, Gujranwalla, Multan, Hoshiarpur and Gurdaspur.[16]

It is regretted that we do not have any information about the life of Latif, particularly before he joined the government service. That must have been the formative period during which he developed a fascination and flair for writing history. It is presumed that he was a very close friend of Nur Muhammad Chisti and Rai Bahadur Kanahya Lal. The former belonged to the priestly class whereas the latter was an engineer.[17] Common to both of them, was their interest in history. They wrote in Urdu and Persian. It is presumed that having been inspired by his association with them, Latif wrote first in Urdu. All of them were members of the *Anjuman -i-Punjab*, a provincial association of the liberal Punjabees. Just two years after his appointment he published *History of the Punjab* from Calcutta, a copy of which was recommended by the Punjab Government for presentation to the Queen Empress of India with the following remarks:[18] "Sir James Lyall considers that the work in question is an exceedingly meritorious

one, and it is notable as being the first work of its kind in the English language produced by a native of the Punjab." The book was despatched for acceptance of the Crown on 8 September, 1891.[19]

Muhammad Latif has left to us three valuable contributions, two of them trace the history and antiquity of Lahore and Multan and the third is a comprehensive study of the history of the Punjab. Reasons for selecting the Punjab as his special interest are given in the book itself. Besides, it being the place of his birth, he believed that the Punjab was an important source and that it created in ancient times the great Buddhism. It was here that India received first lessons in sculptural art. Moreover, he perceived it as the spearhead "of this (British) Empire, the guardroom of India on the North."[20]

Muhammad Latif distinguished himself as a pioneer in the writing of history and antiquity of cities.[21] He regretted that Lahore, traditionally a political centre of the Punjab, did not find a place even in the guide books. Except a brief account brought out by T. H. Thornton, we do not find any contemporary literature in the English language on Lahore.[22] However, there were two important works on Lahore, one was in Urdu and the other in Persian. Maulvi Nur Muhammad wrote *Tabqiqat-i-Chisti* in Persian and Kanahya Lal *Tarikh-i-Lahore* in Urdu. But the last mentioned work, observes Latif, "contains little that is new, and that of Chisti is full of stories of supernatural powers, supposed to have been possessed by local saints whose tombs are still numerous in the neighbourhood of Lahore."[23] But that was not enough was the feeling of Latif. His account of Lahore is full of details about the antiquity and location of both medieval and modern buildings with beautiful illustrations in half tone. It also includes the story of the world famous diamond *Kohinoor* which now adorns the crown of the British Queen Elizabeth II and also inscriptions on the guns of the Khalsa Army and coins of Ranjit Singh. Much before he got official appointment at Multan, Latif, on the pattern of Lahore account, got two articles published on Multan in the *Calcutta Review*.[24] However, he established himself as a historian of no mean calibre by writing the *History of the Punjab: From the Remotest Antiquity to The Present Time* (Calcutta, 1881).

We do not know how and when Latif got the idea of writing such a detailed account of the Punjab. Inspiration, if there was any, was certainly not indigenous for there was no tradition of scientific historical scholarship in any of the languages of India barring a few stereotyped historical narratives. In the absence of a tradition of historical scholarship or training therein, the Indian historian of the nineteenth century was in the habit of aping the Western scholars. Therefore in much of the historical literature of that century, one would only find an imitative historical bent rather than mature historical philosophy. Nevertheless, counting Latif in the latter category, it can be said with adequate justification that he was

different from his contemporaries. His political awareness persuaded him to seek an explanation and solution of the problem of his times in history. Inspired by his association with writers in Indian languages and well informed of the historical literature produced by the Europeans, he presents in himself a reasonable synthesis of the two. Here he is radically different from his contemporaries.

Muhammad Latif combined in his personality, three built-in characteristics, which when clashed or overlapped, confuse a reader. He was an Indian, a Muslim and an official of the British Indian administration. A careful perusal of his writings would show his changing attitude and treatment from problem to problem and from chapter to chapter, sometimes obviously contradicting himself. His reviewers have not so far taken him seriously and brushed him off in a few lines. Underestimating Latif as a historian, Cantwell Smith writes, "An early writer, not professionally academic, but writing as British historians of that time..."[25] Elaborating his viewpoint, he further adds that "the author treats the Sikh Wars and so on just as a British Official; and even makes use of Latin tags."[26] Latif, therefore, deserves a better treatment not by way of favour but by obligation. Placed as he was, as stated above, by national circumstances, his attitude and thinking was conditioned by the contemporary liberalism and the Muslim renaissance.

Though an admirer of Macaulay particularly for his style,[27] Latif either deliberately ignores or fails to comprehend the underlying idea of his writings. Macaulay's assertion that the cause of British success was their moral superiority over the Indians does not find favour with Muhammad Latif. His problem was more political than moral or even cultural. Therefore, he followed later, his contemporary official historians like Richard Temple, Sir C. Aitchison, Sir A. Colvin and others. The tremendous upheaval of 1857 not only lifted from British mind the so-called 'white man's burden', but also reduced the whole concept of British imperialism to the mere political one. "Their political convictions, confirmed by Indian experience, were in favour of strong government directed by high intelligence and governing by means of scientific laws, fearlessly and efficiently administered",[28] observes Eric Stokes. Extending his support for having a strong government of that kind as against the demand for representation and equality by the members of the Indian National Congress, Latif warns Indians:[29] "Remember that you are as yet learning your alphabet in the great School of Progress, that you have only just set your foot on the threshold of that grand institution, that you are as yet but on the first step of the ladder which leads to the lofty palace of Human Glory, and that the ambitious ideas of some among you, of equality with the conquerors of the East, will in the end redound to your own discomfiture and hurt."

Thus, he not only provides a reasonable justification for the support to British rule in India, but also suggests that the change so eagerly sought

for by the extremists could await till the institutions like rule of law, and peace and order was firmly established. He, however, was convinced like other liberals of the times of the role of the British rule and the great destiny of India.

Moreover, contemporary political situation and the position of minorities therein led him to assist the British in maintaining stable and strong government. The Muslims after losing political power to the British suspected British designs and, therefore, remained socially, economically and politically isolated from the main stream of national life. After the Revolt of 1857, the lead was taken by Sir Syad Ahmad to raise the backward Muslim community to the level which the Hindus had achieved during the past few decades. Economic and cultural lag of the Muslims and political necessity of the British Indian Government helped in removing the gulf between the two. As a sort of epilogue to his major work, he once wrote, "the quick witted Bengali and the thrifty Hindus have eagerly seized the opportunity for advancement approved by British Civilization which the Muhammadan and the Sikh has each in turn neglected."[30] He appealed to the leaders of public opinion in his community to devote themselves in the amelioration of the Muslims and shun politics.[31] Merely on the basis of common historical situation and conterminous interests of the British and the Muslim, it is certainly far fetched to assume that Muhammad Latif was one of the many official historians. What was a conviction and objective with Muhammad Latif, was a political postulate with the British Indian Government. He visualised fulfilment of the Muslim renaissance in the assistance of the government whereas the latter sought a political lever in the minorities.

If at all, Latif is to be characterised as a historian, he can be said, though vaguely, a liberal Muslim historian, rationally advocating the cause of his community. He is generally confused to be an official historian for apparent reasons, viz., he was an official of the government of a fairly good rank; he pressed information mostly available in the writings of the British official historians and like most of his contemporaries he ungrudgingly complimented the British rule. But his originality lies in projecting sharply the political problems of the Muslims of the Punjab through various stages.

One of the major problems which confront all students of history is the problem of separating regional history from the intricate filigree of the history of the sub-continent. But the magnitude of the problem correspondingly decreases if the political boundaries of the regions are co-terminous with linguistic or cultural boundaries as is the case with Rajasthan. With regard to the Punjab, such a development started with Ranjit Singh culminating in the formation of the Punjabi Suba in 1966. The rise and fall

of empires in the ancient and medieval periods from within the Punjab or its neighbourhood, not only corroded the frontier of a distinct province but also gave birth to fluid in the beginning and by and large flexible culture and institutions. Since the Punjab formed a base for invaders to establish empires in India, a home for communities migrating to India, a treasure house for free-booters and a rich market for traders to procure goods to carry them across the frontiers, it is neither possible nor desirable to separate completely the history of the Punjab from that of India. Nevertheless, Latif took great care to avoid entering into the broad subject of Indian history as far as possible. But his attempt to separate the two histories is, without any doubt, more artificial than natural. His conception of the Punjab history does not emerge from within the cultural and social heritage. Adopting scissors and paste methods Latif culled out large chunks of events having a bearing on the Punjab from the current available information on Indian history. This is a very conspicuous feature of the first two parts of his book on the *History of the Punjab*.

The book is divided into five major sections, the first dealing with the ancient Punjab. Having no pretensions of an original researcher of history, Latif entirely depends on English sources like James Mill, W. W. Hunter, General Cunningham and others, for the ancient period of Punjab history. Despite research in the ancient Indian literature and society conducted by H. H. Wilson, Prinsep, William Jones and Max Müller, the knowledge of history of this period remained to be so miserably inadequate that a non-professional historian had no scope to give anything new. As Latif took liberty with the placement of historical data, he made certain interpolation in treatment and explanation of facts. Introduction of a chapter on 'Modern Hindus' in this section, though appearing superfluous, amply demonstrates the purpose which the book was to serve. Following the account of James Mill, whose knowledge of India was neither personal nor original, Latif lists some of the evil practices of the early nineteenth century Hindu society and their corrupting influence on the Muslims. If there was any perceptible identity between the two cultures of the Hindus and the Muslims, it was not primarily because of the former's influence over the latter but because of the fact that the two cultures were arrested by the same social, economic and also ecological conditions. Moreover, the proselytised Muslims no doubt embraced a new religion but could not do away with their own indigenous culture. As a matter of fact, Latif tried to view ancient India from the perspective of the nineteenth century Hindu society. Unhistorical as this process of thinking is, observations emanating from such a process of thinking are sometimes wrong and generally superficial.[52] For instance, his references that the Hindus in ancient India never lent money for gain. In other words, Latif asserts that there was no usury in ancient India, which is not supported by historical facts; the principal profession of the nineteenth-century Hindus was money-lending or *Sahukara*.[53]

As a large number of the Muslim cultivators were indebted to the Hindu moneylenders, it can be safely presumed that Latif here is giving expression to their grievance.

His assessment of Indian religions also suffers from similar defects. His contention that "Jainism is, properly speaking, a compromise between Hinduism and Buddhism" is too simple an explanation for a complex socio-religious phenomenon of the ancient period.[31] If viewed from the nineteenth century situation in the Punjab where Jains operated more as a class than as a religious group, one finds identity between the two communities. This identity is not of religious philosophy but of socio-religious practices which sometimes transcend religious barrier. About the decline of Buddhism in India, one witnesses, again, an emotional element operating in the author's analysis and receiving precedence over the historical. Latif observes:[35] "In the abstract, it was atheism, coupled with a system of rigid self mortifications and penances; it shunned the very idea of future state and declared annihilation or nothingness (*Nirvana*) to be the end of the present existence. A religion so barren in its results proved distasteful to the lively and imaginative people of India."

Continuing in a similar strain in his writings on the Medieval Punjab, Latif responded to western thought as mediated by the British, "not by a convolution within Muslim culture itself."[36] It is not to suggest that the Muslim historians did not present problems and challenges in their writings. There are three major strands which one can easily discern in the Muslim writings, viz., it provides justification to the medieval state, religion and institutions; it is an urge for modernisation or an appeal to the Muslims to accept modern institutions; and it is a commentary on the future of Muslims. It may appear to be an unhistorical approach since it implies re-interpretation of medieval times in terms of the nineteenth or twentieth century political system. Latif was no exception to this phenomenon. Here again, as in the section on ancient Indian history, Latif has failed to evolve the medieval Punjab. Instead he gives a narration of political events, historical myths and antecedents pertaining to the personal life of the royal family. The dichotomy of his account is that he, on the one hand, tries hard to justify the Muslim rulers, while on the other, he is critical of the Mughal absolutism or such like institutions which stood in contrast to the modern liberal institutions.

To illustrate this attitude, mention may be made of two controversial issues, foundation of the *Din-i-Ilahi* by Akbar and responsibility of Aurangzeb for the downfall of the Mughal Empire. With regard to the first, Latif does not make a categorical statement that Akbar had a political objective in mind in the founding of *Din-i-Ilahi*. However, Akbar, in his opinion, declared himself as the spiritual guide to Islam by innovating divine monotheism and consequently freed himself from the authority of the Caliph. Founding of *Din-i-Ilahi* no doubt offended the Mahomedans.[37]

Reaction to this among the Muslims was certainly not uniformly antagonistic. Since it was not obligatory for any one to join, its proper appraisal can only be made in view of rapidly changing socio-religious phenomenon of the country, and the *Bhakti* movement, a movement of cultural synthesis. Alienation of *Ulemas* by Akbar did not substantially harm the stability of the Mughal state. Whereas, according to the author, Aurangzeb's "bigotry and intolerance towards Hindus revived religious animosities between the various classes of population and the disintegration of races to which his hypocrisy gave rise, paved the way for the speedy dismemberment of the once powerful Mughal monarchy in India."[38] The religious policy of the Mughals was not the sole factor in the decline of the Empire. In fact, Aurangzeb's policy, including religious policy, needs historical reappraisal. To Latif, study of history is purposive, teleological. On the basis of this assumption, though Latif's ideas are not clear, it may be presumed that the British rule of toleration, regard for all races and equality of treatment was not anti-Islamic. In this can be traced the reason for his unfair and unhistorical treatment of the medieval Indian history in general, and Akbar and Aurangzeb in particular.

The rise and growth of Sikhism was a significant factor in moulding the socio-political ferment of the Punjab. It was a reaction to the monolithic, rigid and close society of the sixteenth century. It corroded the fossilized social base of the political authority in the Punjab. Starting as a reform movement, it became an organised, well-knit, yet an open society during the Guru period.[39] Dynamic as this movement was, Latif befittingly devotes the major part of his book to its study. For lack of historical source material, not much is known about this period. Contemporary historiography reflects two kinds of attitudes based on the grim struggle between the Muslims and the Sikhs. The *Janam Sakhis*, the Sikh sources of history of the Gurus, are full of fictions and fabrications. Devoted as they were to the Guru, they "were cautious in concealing the weak points of their religious leaders and in giving prominence to anything which redounds to their glory."[40] Latif also wants the reader to remember "that the original writers were men who occupied a very low position in the scale of civilization and whose education and mode of life was far inferior to those of the growing generation."[41] Since these were biased, partisan and coloured accounts written in defence of the Gurus, Latif rejected them as inadequate material.[42] Nonetheless, he used them to reconstruct the life of the Gurus, "The Mahomedan writers may, on a point of difference, be safely consulted, as it is very unsafe to rely implicitly on all that the Sikh historians have said",[43] opines Latif. His partiality for the Muslim historians is as arbitrary as his rejection of the Sikh writers. It is not within the purview of this paper to assess the historical validity of the Sikh or the Muslim writers.

But Latif ought to have examined all the sources and evidences of the Sikhs before rejecting them outrightly. Historical bias or individual commitment or involvement in the Muslim works was, if not equal, at least as definite as in the case of Sikh writers. Strangely enough, Latif, like all other historians of the Punjab, depends heavily on the *Janam-sakhis* translated or related by Malcolm, McGregor or Trumpp, as the sources of information for the period of Guru Nanak.

Starting with a premise popular among the nineteenth century peoples of the Punjab that Guru Nanak was nearer to the Muslims, Latif tries to make us believe that "an idea generally prevailed among the Mohammedans that Nanak was a true follower of the Prophet."[44] Here he also refers to a dispute on the death of Nanak between the Hindus and the Muslims regarding the disposal of his dead body. Till the accession of Arjun Dev, the fifth Guru, who by establishing a system of *Masands* assumed dictatorship and made the Sikhs accustomed to a regular system of government, it continued as a peaceful social movement. If the whole movement was political which the author believes, there was no reason for Latif to hold Chandu responsible for the martyrdom of the Guru. For the same reason Latif could have explained the short-lived friendship between Guru Hargobind and the Mughal Emperor Jahangir. It is only in connection with Guru Teg Bahadur that Latif makes a categorical statement. He writes:[45] "The aspirations of the Sikh Guru were high, and, though suppressed by the stern Aurangzeb, were fully exhibited during the latter part of Guru Teg Bahadur's life, as manifesting kingly rather than priestly, aims, changing eventually, in offensive quietists into fanatical warriors."

Since a gulf was created between the two, Latif becomes unreasonably harsh to Gobind Singh who staked his life to fight the unjust and cruel government of the Mughals. He dubbed him as an "irreconcilable enemy of every Mohammedan".[46] Weak as he was to challenge the Mughal authority, he, in the opinion of Latif, became a staunch worshipper of *Durga*, a Hindu goddess. It is interesting to note that Latif on the one hand suggests that he derived inspiration to found the *Khalsa* and its symbols from *Durga*, whereas, on the other, he asserts that it was the desire of the Guru "to give the Sikhs a distinct national character, and a spirit of opposition to Hinduism," as they were generally averse to blue clothes.[47] He further goes on to prove that the children of Gobind Singh were buried alive in the walls at the instance of the Hindu Dewan of Sirhind. As he wants the reader to swallow these facts without objection, he suggests that the non-Muslim historians "deliberately ignore the fact that the instigator of the crime was a Hindu Kuljas, the Governor's Dewan, who bore a personal grudge against Govind". The whole account is not only illogical, inconsistent and full of contradiction, it is unhistorical. When he could refute, without any valid argument, the Sikh writers, or when he failed to exercise his own historical sense in suggesting to the students of history to place

more reliance on the Muslim writers, it appears nothing more than an apologia in a historical study.

Inspired by a bitter feeling of revenge against the cruel government, Banda continued Guru Gobind's struggle. Latif is extremely critical of the barbarities perpetrated by Banda and holds, to a considerable extent, Guru Gobind responsible for his acts. "Gobind's selection of Banda," observes Latif, "as his successor, does not appear to have been the result of any very great opinion he had formed of his piety, or of his ability to propagate the religion of which he had been so long the leader, but rather to have been made with a view to his avenging the death of his father and two sons, for which purpose he could not have singled out a better instrument than this ruthless sucker."[48] Taking advantage of the schism among the Sikhs and Banda's inferior position in the eyes of the Sikhs to that of the Guru, Latif dubbed him as a "ruthless sucker". In this he not only minimises the mission of Guru Gobind but also ignores the fact that Banda could not have done anything else in the face of a cruel government which took the Sikhs for arch enemies. At another place Latif writes, "His triumphs are not remembered as heroic acts, but as malicious and cold-blooded atrocities. His ruling and insatiable passion was that of pouring out Mahomedan blood."[49] Same can be said about the policy of the Mughal Government towards the Sikhs. It was the eighteenth century, when mutual trust or respect for human beings was not or could not be the order of the day.

The vacuum created by political turmoil in the Punjab was filled up by the Sikh chieftains known as *misaldars*. With the increase in their authority in the regions forming a "theocratic federation", the suppressed Muslims and lower classes emigrated to the British territories where they enjoyed religious freedom. From the Sikh theocratic federation to the establishment of monarchy, rather to the annexation of the Punjab, Latif had one major point to emphasise like the British that it was a political struggle of the medieval type. It is in the same tenor that he describes the reign of Ranjit Singh. He appreciates the wisdom of Ranjit in realising the superior strength of the British, and therefore maintaining friendly relations with them. Before going into the sources used by the author it appears necessary to elaborate some of the important points as given below:

(a) Latif's opinion about Ranjit Singh,
(b) and his policy vis-a-vis that of the British towards the North West Frontier.

After having increased his power, Ranjit Singh began to entertain a notion that he was the Lord of the whole Sikh. Latif says, "Ranjit Singh preferred to be called Khalsaji, signifying the whole body of the Sikhs, and in all public documents this word had the same signification as that of the *Maharaja* or *Sarkar*."[50] Whatever may be the true nature of his rule, as far as his pronouncements are concerned, he at least ostensibly believed

himself to be a servant of the *Khalsa*. Moreover, he was depicted as a war-lord whose main concern was fighting and maintaining his territory by force of arms. He submitted to the superior military strength and crushed the inferior one. The whole narrative brings out that there were two classes, the nobility and the poor. Himself a simple man, his court and the nobles were very glamorous, suggesting that the nobility was the base of his political power. After praising his religiosity, his broadmindeness, his vigour and his imagination, Latif makes a derogatory remark which has no relevance to diplomacy, politics and state-craft. He observes, "In his pursuit of ambition or pleasure, he was indifferent alike to the pledges of friendship and to the ties of blood or affection".[51]

Being nearer to that historical phenomenon than any other historian, Latif could have dealt with the problems of the administration and social conditions in the Punjab. Only then it could have been possible to see Ranjit Singh's reign in the proper historical perspective. It is understandable why the nobility of Ranjit Singh, after his death, betrayed. But it still needs further researches to find out as to why the Khalsa army put up a few of the most effective resistances to the British arms, as to why there were no revolts or challenges to the state of Ranjit Singh, as to why the state did not parcel out into small units despite conspiracies and conflicts, and as to why Ranjit Singh was feared by the nobles and revered by the peoples of the Punjab. Despite the researches which have been recently[52] conducted, we do not have a clear picture of his institutions. Therefore, in view of the limited information any judgement on Ranjit is either motivated or unhistorical. The composite character of his state and social institutions has so far been avoided in any historical study

As regards the problem of the North-West Frontier, like all other official historians, Latif, admitting the British political motives in that region, follows a line of argument in defence of the British when the conflict of interest in Sind between the two powers crystallised in Colonel Pottinger's political mission. Latif betraying his historical objectivity observes, "it was not thought proper to make any communication yet to the Maharaja, lest he should endeavour by secret working, to counteract the peaceful and beneficial project of the British Government."[53] It implied that the British in India had never reposed their confidence in their friendship with Ranjit Singh, that they had political designs counteracting those of Ranjit Singh in Sind, that the British mission was a moral one, a part of civilizing mission. This conflict did not lead to war over a region which Ranjit Singh coveted for many years. The wily chief of Lahore, as Latif calls him, "had learnt to respect the power of the English."[54] Whereas the British object was to act with discretion and moderation, and to remain on friendly[55] terms with States having conflicting interests. It clearly reflects the attitude of the author which he maintains on the subject till the annexation of the Punjab by the British.

The British did not allow the fate of the Punjab to remain in suspense for a long time. The confusion caused by the two schools for and against the annexation of the Punjab closed with a predicted end in 1849. Differences among the officials over annexation have divided modern historians in their analysis of the causes leading to the annexation of the Punjab. Those who depend on the pronouncements of the officials in favour of annexation believe it to be a premeditated act.[56] Whereas Dr. Bal in his yet-to-be published but much publicised thesis firmly believes that it was not a pre-meditated step. In fact, he goes to say that the British government was not in favour of annexation.[57] What still remains to be studied is as to why the British vacillated. Was it due to the opposition they expected from within the Punjab or due to some other reasons? It is certain that the people of the Punjab did not invite the Britishers.

The line of approach which Latif adopted has confused many an official and a historian. Like other official historians, he thinks that "the British Government of India had throughout acted with utmost forbearance and moderation in their relations with the Sikh Darbar, and the policy of the Governor-General had, from the outset, been wholly unaggressive and entirely free from taint of greed and ambition."[58] But the question arises whether or not this sentiment of the British or their desire to establish a strong empire was the motivating force to subjugate the whole of India. If the former is true, the author has been solely on the wrong side of the table. The rest, till 1880, is nothing but moral and material reports of the British Indian Government in the Punjab. Perhaps the author tried to place the Sikh administration in contrast to that of the British, showing the latter as based on justice, rule of law and social welfare.

From the source-material which of course was very limited on the life and times of Ranjit Singh, Latif found much to admire in the Maharaja, but he also detected and explained in the text the weaknesses of the Sikh empire. The source material amply demonstrates these two aspects, since in this the official historians found justification of the British rule in the Punjab. In those contemporary writings it was not the common man of the Punjab who found a place. Accounts of the Punjab by Indians closely follow the pattern and style of medieval chronicles while the works of the Europeans were not objective. Latif mainly relied on the following available sources:

(i) Sir Lepel Griffin: *The Punjab Chiefs, Rajas of Punjab.*
(ii) Joseph Davey Cunningham: *A History of the Sikhs.*
(iii) Henry T. Prinsep: *Origin of the Sikh Power in the Punjab and Political Life of Maharaja Ranjit Singh.*
(iv) W. L. McGregor: *The History of the Sikhs*, 2 volumes.

(v) Colonel O'sborne: *The Court and Camp of Ranjit Singh.*
(vi) Carmichael Smyth: *A History of the Family of Lahore.*
(vii) Lt. Col. Stenback: *The Punjab.*

Non-English Sources:

(i) Sohan Lal Suri — History of the Punjab in Persian.
(ii) Moulvi Din Muhammad: *History of the Punjab*, manuscripts handed over to the author by Munshi Ghulam Farid Khan, Extra Assistant Commissioner, son of Din Muhammad.
(iii) Dewan Amar Nath: *Khalsa Dewan* (Persian manuscript).
(iv) Rai Kanhia Lal: A History of the reign of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. Title: *Zafar Namah-i -Ranjit Singh* (Urdu).

Except for Sohan Lal Suri's Persian work, Latif did not use the Indian authors for they were hyperbolic in style and fiction-loaded in account.

Readers of Latif's *History of the Punjab* will be disappointed if they expect to find in it any historical theory or even any reasoned history. Latif made no special effort to give a neat and brief formula to explain the problems of the Punjab history. Nevertheless, there is also no reason to believe, as can be now clearly seen, that he strove hard in life for mere fascination for history. Like many of his contemporaries he saw a close parallel between the interests of British rule in India and the Muslims of India. He, like all other liberals, found redemption of his fellow brethren in the continuation of the British rule in India. He deplored the Muslim backwardness and socio-political isolation. He did not take any active part in the social reform movement to promote the interest of his class. An admirer of the British values and modern institutions, Latif, to serve his countrymen, went to quite absurd lengths in attempting to prove that British rule in India was nothing but beneficial. He laboured this thesis so ardently that he made countless references obliquely or directly to the contemporary situation in a polemical spirit.

Latif was not consciously trying to save the British Empire in India nor was he writing for fame. He was neither a bigot nor an anti-national. As an individual he was one of those many educated liberals who did not approve of the methods of the Indian National Congress and who had complete faith in the British sense of justice. When he projected the crisis of identity of the Muslim community, he behaved in the way any other liberal would have behaved irrespective of his religion. Therefore, while making any judgement upon Latif as a historian, it is necessary to keep in view the age he lived in. In spite of the distractions and demands of official work, he was the first Indian who wrote one of the most compre-

hensive histories of the Punjab and two tracts on Lahore and Multan. By virtue of this he earned a well-deserved title of Syad Muhammad Latif, the historian of the Punjab.

REFERENCES

*Unfortunately details about the life of Syad Muhammad Latif are not available. Effort has been made by the author to find out bio-data from the proceedings of the Home Department, Government of India, and the Civil Lists of Punjab but with a marginal success. The spellings of the name of the author under study will be as given by the author himself.

1. "History can be about only what the historian can know: not the real past, but the thought he can re-think." See article on "Collingwood's Theory of Historical Knowing", by Leon J. Goldstein, in *History and Theory*, pp. 3, 36.
2. *Ibid.*; Also see R. G. Collingwood's *The Idea of History*, (Oxford paperbacks) pp. 282-302.
3. Syad Muhammad Latif, *History of the Punjab*, (Calcutta, 1891), Preface, p. vi. The author has consulted Reprint published in 1964.
4. *Ibid.*
5. "....Ranke stands before us as the great founder of the school of objective history. In the preface to his very first book, written in 1824, when he was not yet thirty, he stated that he did not presume, as did most historians, to sit in judgement on the past; that he only wanted to show what had really happened." He was charged for his objectivity and matter-of-factness by all succeeding historians including his great disciple Lord Acton. See Pieter Geyl's *Debates with Historians* (The Fontana O Collins paper, first published in 1955), p. 9.
6. See article by J. D. M. Derrett on "J. H. Nelson: A Forgotten Administrator-Historian of India" in C. H. Philips' (ed.) *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon* (London, 1962, Reprint), p. 354.
7. See article by the author on "European Historians on Guru Nanak" in the *Proceedings of the Punjab History Conference*, 1969-70.
8. See article by S. S. Bal on "Joseph Davey Cunningham's Dismissal From Political Service" in *Essays on History, Literature, Art and Culture* (New Delhi, 1970), by K. S. Bedi and S. S. Bal (eds.) p. 129.
9. General Sir John J. H. Gordon's book, *The Sikhs* (London, 1904), was published after the Coronation Celebrations in England in which Baba Sir Khem Singh Bedi, lineal descendant in the fourteenth generation from Guru Nanak was honoured. In his eulogising account, the author has attempted to prove that the Sikhs being originally Scythians, maintained their independent culture through the ages, *ipso facto*, they formed a separate nation (the word nation is not used in the sense strictly political). He wrongly asserts in his book that Guru Nanak and the rest of the Gurus were *Jats* (see pp. 2, 27). He unequivocally expressed his sentiments through the reproduction of Baba Sir Khem Singh's appeal, "...that the political object which led the Sikhs to adopt military life, viz., the establishment of perfect Government and the maintenance of a rule of justice and religious toleration has been completely realized under

the reign of the British Government, and that the Sikhs, fully regarding that Government as a god-send, have accordingly placed themselves entirely at its service." See pp. 25-60

10. S. S. Bal, *Guru Nanak in The Eyes of Non-Sikhs* (Chandigarh, 1969), p. 144. Author's terse but brief observation given below appears to be a hasty pronouncement rather than a serious assessment made after a deep study of European writers. He says that Latif "was trying to imitate great British administrators of the nineteenth century, such as Malcolm, Prinsep, Henry Lawrence, J. D. Cunningham, R. N. Cust and Sir Lepel Griffin in this labour of love."
11. See *Punjab Civil List*, 1889, vol. I, January-March. He was probably born in Lahore.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Mentioned in the *Punjab Civil List*, 1892, vol. III, July-October.
14. *Punjab Civil List*, 1897, vol. III, July-October.
15. The Secretary of State's despatch to the Governor-General of India, 1 September, 1898, in Home Establishment.
16. His name does not appear on the government records after March, 1901.
17. For this piece of information I am indebted to Dr. Ganda Singh the foremost scholar of the Punjab History.
18. From the Government of Punjab to the Government of India, 24 August, 1891, Home (Public), September, 1891, no. 33A.
19. From the Government of India to the Secretary of State for India, September, 1891, *Ibid.*
20. Syad Muhammad Latif, *Lahore—its History, Architectural Remains and Antiquities* (Lahore, 1892), Preface, p. II.
21. Other tracts on the historic cities are, S. M. Jaffer's *Peshawar: Past and Present* (being an account of Peshawar compiled from original sources), Punjab University Press, Lahore, 1952, Punjab University Publication no. 34. On the occasion of Indian History Congress, Patiala Session, 1967, the Department of Punjab Historical Studies published a brief history, *Patiala and Its Surroundings.*
22. T. M. Thornton, *A Brief Account of the History and Antiquities of Lahore.* The author was then Secretary to the Government of Punjab and subsequently judge of the Chief Court. Revised edition of this publication of 1873 was brought out in 1876 by J. L. Kipling, Principal of the Mayo School of Arts, Lahore.
23. Latif, *op. cit.*, Preface, p. V.
24. Syad Muhammad Latif, *Early History of Multan;* reprinted from the *Calcutta Review*, October, 1890 and April, 1891 by Civil and Military Gazette Press, 1891.
25. See article by W. Cantwell Smith on "Modern Muslim Historical Writing in English" in C. H. Philip (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 324.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Latif, *op. cit.*, Preface, p. X. The author regrets that Macaulay did not write a History of India. "Had the great essayist taken up his pen to write a history of this country, he would not, in all human probability, have omitted to lay before the world the other side of the picture. He would have informed us whence the wealth had come which enabled the Imperial Court to maintain its state, or the Viceroys of Provinces to decorate their palaces and entertain a countless host of retainers, and what means were employed in accumulating these vast treasures for Imperial exchequer," says Latif.
28. See article by E.T. Stokes on "The Administrators And Historical Writing on India", in C. H. Philip, *op. cit.*, p. 389.
29. Latif, *op. cit.*, Preface, p. XII
30. *Ibid.*, p. 630.
31. *Ibid.*
32. See Latif, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 50-52.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 49. The author, of course, is aware of the fact that Buddhism was a popular religion during the reign of Asoka and Harsha. Does the author mean that Indians were not imaginative and lively during those periods of history? Does he mean the same for all the peoples who even now practise and preach this religion in the Punjab? Did it not satisfy the imagination of the Punjabees? Such problems are better understood with the grasp of cultural dynamism and social change.
36. See article on "Modern Muslim Historical Writing on Medieval Muslim India" by P. Hardy. See Philip, *op. cit.*, p. 306.
37. Latif, *op. cit.*, p. 146. The author also mentions a few other innovations.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 179.
39. See two articles on "Foundation of the Khalsa Panth" by Fauja Singh; Bedi and Bal, *op. cit.*, p. 74; and the *Punjab: Past and Present*, April, 1971, p. 197.
40. Latif, *op. cit.*, p. 268. f.n.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 240 f.n.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 268, f.n.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 248.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
45. *Ibid.*, 261.
46. *Ibid.*, 264.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 268 f.n.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 281.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 280.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 372 f.n.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 496.
52. A number of books have been published recently wholly or partly dealing with this period. Dr. Fauja Singh's *Military System of Ranjit Singh* is the only publication which deals with one of the major aspects of Ranjit Singh's administrative system.
53. Latif, *op. cit.*, p. 455.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 456.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 473.
56. Ganda Singh, *The British Occupation of the Punjab* (Patiala, 1956); also see Introduction, *Private Correspondence Relating to the Anglo-Sikh War* (Patiala, 1955).
57. S. S. Bal in doctoral thesis which is due to reach the reader after publication boldly asserts these conclusions. See *British Policy Towards the Punjab*, (1844-49), unpublished thesis of London University.
58. Latif, *op. cit.*, pp. 571-72.

SITA RAM KOHLI

DR. FAUJA SINGH

(Punjabi University, Patiala)

SCIENTIFIC research in the field of history in the Punjab dates from the second decade of the present century. Two most memorable names associated with its start were Karam Singh and Sita Ram Kohli. Both started their work more or less simultaneously, but whereas Karam Singh derived his inspiration mainly from the Singh Sabha Movement of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century that had leavened the Sikh community and created among its members a new interest in the study of Sikh history, Sita Ram Kohli was indebted for his interest in historical research to his western education and European teachers and friends, such as H.L.O. Garrett and John Thompson.

Sita Ram hailed from the Shahpur district of the Punjab which is now in West Pakistan. He was born on February 28, 1889, at Bhera, a historical and flourishing town which was also the principal seat of the tehsil of the same name. He came of a middle-class Kohli Khatri family and his parents, as was usual with middle-class families then, were most keen on providing the western education to their sons. The result was that both Sita Ram and his brother Ganga Ram received education up to the M.A. standard and became teachers in colleges. The early education upto Matriculation was received by Sita Ram at the Government High School, Bhera. After that he shifted to Lahore and joined the D.A.V. College there. After a short stay at this College, he joined the Government College, Lahore, where he passed his B.A. and M.A. examinations. The subject in which he obtained his M.A. degree was History. As he was one of the best students in the batch that passed out, he was granted the Alexandra Research Scholarship by the Punjab University, Lahore, for conducting research in history. Happily, this saved him for history, for he was, after passing his M.A. examination, keen on the study of law and was about to join the Law College, Lahore, when the grant of the scholarship was announced.

In 1913-14 the eminent British historian Ramsay Muir came to Lahore as a visiting Professor in the Department of History, Punjab University, Lahore. He remained at Lahore for a period of six months from October 1913 to March 1914. The visit of Ramsay Muir kindled great interest in historical research, particularly in the field of Punjab history. His scholarly address at the fourth annual meeting of the Punjab Historical Society at Lahore on January 31, 1914 (now printed in the first issue of the history

journal of the Punjabi University, *Punjab Past and Present*), spelt out the vast scope of historical research in India. Two positive results followed from this: (i) reinvigoration of the Punjab University Historical Society as a forum of discussion with a regular journal of its own where selected research papers could be printed; (ii) realization of the necessity of a thorough search for the records of the Khalsa period preceding the British rule in the Punjab. As the idea of promoting historical research had the active backing of some high-ups in the official hierarchy, the work was immediately taken up with zest and earnestness. The Governor of the Punjab, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, ordered an all-out search in the Civil Secretariat for the Khalsa Durbar Records. This resulted, before long, in the discovery of a huge mass of dust-laden records bound in bundles and lying neglected in an obscure corner of the Secretariat building. These records were all in Persian written in the *Shikasta* (running) hand, and as such presented considerable difficulty in their decipherment. But this could not be allowed to come in the way of work on them, rather the greater the challenge, the greater was the incentive to meet it. Young Sita Ram, who was known for his proficiency in Persian and for his deep interest in history, was assigned in 1915 the difficult task of preparing a detailed catalogue of the newly discovered records. He worked on them with devotion and diligence for a period of five years from 1915 to 1919. During these years he scanned and catalogued nearly three lakh folios covering the greater portion of the Khalsa period, 1811 to 1849. Writing about them, he says in his Preface to his book, *Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, "These records had passed into the possession of the British at the time of the annexation of the Punjab in 1849 but for long seventy years they remained bound in bundles unused by any body. I was the first to untie the bundles and satchels of these records and it was with great labour that I became skilled in the art of reading the difficult *Shikasta* handwriting of Persian. Gradually, however, I was able to prepare a catalogue of the records of each department giving date, number and other necessary particulars. These catalogues were subsequently published by the Punjab Government in two volumes under the name, *Catalogue of Khalsa Durbar Records*."

The tremendous success with which Sita Ram accomplished his first project, admittedly a difficult undertaking, brought him success in his personal career as well. After the expiry of the Alexandra Research Scholarship, he was taken into government service (not an easy thing in those days) and appointed a lecturer in History at the Government College, Lahore. He was at this College for many long years, during which period he not only carried on his own research activities, but by his mature guidance and first-hand knowledge of the abundant historical material available in the Punjab Government Records Office, helped a large number of post-graduate students and scholars to write dissertations and monographs. In

view of his good work he was subsequently appointed Deputy Records Keeper, Punjab. He was at this time also a permanent member of the Punjab University Historical Society and took keen interest in the organisation and deliberations of the Sikh History Society at Lahore in 1931. Taking advantage of his long stay at Lahore, he built his own house there. Apart from providing the facility of abundant research material, his continued stay at the capital enabled him to be near his kith and kin, for his brother Ganga Ram Kohli was a lecturer in Botany at the local Dyal Singh College and his father-in-law, Lala Ruchi Ram Sahney, was an eminent practising lawyer of Lahore. He was lucky to be connected with Ruchi Ram who had a deep interest in history. Ruchi Ram's daughter, Lilawati, married to Sita Ram, was a talented lady (she is alive yet) who was always of great help to her husband in his research projects.

While Sita Ram Kohli was in service at Lahore, he wrote besides the aforesaid two volumes, *Catalogue of Khalsa Durbar Records*, two books, namely, *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* (Urdu) and *The Indus Valley Civilization*, and several papers. Besides, he edited a Persian source book, *Zafarnama* by Dewan Amar Nath and an English book, *Trial of Mul Raj*.

On his promotion to the higher cadre of Class I, he was appointed Principal of the Government College, Hoshiarpur. From there, some years later, he was transferred to the Government College, Rohtak. It was here that he retired from government service. He wanted to settle down, after retirement, at Rohtak, and actually built himself a house there. But he was not allowed to lead a retired life yet, and was re-employed in January 1946 as the Principal of Ranbir College, Sangrur, as well as Superintendent, Education Department, Jind State. On the 20th December of the same year he was asked to hold the post of the Secretary, Education Department, Jind State, concurrently with the post of the Principal he already held. With the creation of the Pepsu in 1948, he ceased to function as the Secretary of the Education Department. He continued as Principal till 4 November, 1951 when he finally retired from service and settled down at Rohtak.

After Sita Ram became Principal about the beginning of the forties, his research work suffered a serious set-back on account of the heavy administrative responsibilities assumed by him. In consequence, the period of his life from 1939 to 1949 was almost barren of literary activity, so that we do not come across any great work produced during these years. With his shifting to Sangrur in 1946 his interest in research was revivified and we witness another span of literary activity which continued even after his final retirement from service in 1951. During this period, two Punjabi books, namely, *Fateh Nama Guru Khalsa Ji Ka* by Ganesh Dass and *Shah Muhammad's Var* on the First Anglo-Sikh War and one English book, *India House—Fort William Correspondence*, vol. XXI (not yet published) were edited, while the earlier Urdu work on Maharaja Ranjit Singh was revised

and reproduced in Punjabi with some useful modifications. Besides, there was one original work on which he concentrated during the last years of his life. This was *The last Phase, 1839-1849* which has been posthumously published under the title, *Sunset of the Sikh Empire.*

Lala (better known as Principal) Sita Ram Kohli died in August 1962 at Rohtak which he had made his permanent place of residence since his retirement from service. Continued arduous labour over the years ever since he had entered upon a career of research had greatly undermined his health and during the later years of his life he was terribly afflicted by asthma, a disease which probably had its roots in his persistent work for several years on the archaic folios of the Khalsa Durbar, sometimes emitting awful smell. But such was his devotion to work that he never permitted his disease, or failing health to come in the way of either his personal research, or his guidance to, or discussion with research students and scholars. Vidhya Sagar Suri, formerly Director, Punjab State Archives, who has had life-long contacts with Sita Ram, writes in this connection: "Though a man of retiring habits, Principal Kohli gave ungrudging guidance and assistance to all those engaged in research on Punjab history on which he was considered to be an authority. Even the rigours of asthma which afflicted him more and more in later years, could not make him desist from elaborating a point during a personal discussion with him ...one had to cut short one's visit to spare him the heavy strain of prolonged discussion on the subject in which he became absorbed regardless of the time and trouble involved. His road-side house in Model Town, Rohtak, was a haven for research scholars. Weather permitting, he could be seen from a distance laboriously working on his manuscript of a new book. His mature judgment and mastery over the subject was always a source of inspiration for researchers and students of history."

A reference has already been made to Sita Ram Kohli's membership of the Punjab University Historical Society. This was not, however, the only learned society of which he was a member. He was associated with the Indian Historical Records Commission as a corresponding member till death. He not only attended its annual meetings regularly, but also presented a few research papers, the particulars of which are given below:

1. The Records of the Sikh Government in the Punjab Secretariat—presented in 1918 and published in vol. II, pages 23-31.
2. A Promissory Note of the Sikh Times—presented in 1950 and published in vol. XXVII, pages 32-35.
3. A Trained Infantry Battalion—presented in 1955 and published in vol. XXXI, page 1.
4. Document Regulating Succession to the Throne of Lahore, November 1840—presented in 1956 and published in vol. XXXII, page 1.

He was also associated with the Indian History Congress which, in recognition of his valuable researches in the field of Punjab history, elected him President of the Sikh History section of the second session of the Indian History Congress held at Allahabad in 1938. His Presidential Address on this occasion gave a thought-provoking and analytical account of the different phases and sources of Sikh history. Besides the address, he read on this occasion a paper bearing the title, "Ahmad Shah Abdali and the Sikhs (1748-65)". Two years later he presented another paper at the Indian History Congress Session held at Lahore in 1940, the title of the paper being "A Book of Military Parwanas".

It is evident from the foregoing account that Sita Ram's main field of interest and specialisation was the period of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and his successors. The earlier course of Sikh history including the Guru period, the period of the Sikh struggle against the Mughals and the Afghans, and the rule of the Misals was untouched by him except for a few references in his *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* (Urdu) and a single paper concerning Ahmad Shah Abdali and the Sikhs, 1748-65. Outside of his specialised field, a few attempts were, no doubt, made, such as *History of India from beginning to A.D. 1526*, *Students' Historical Atlas of India* and *The Indus Valley Civilisation*. Of these the first two were written as text books for school and college students and were naturally commercially motivated, as is the practice with most text book writers. The third was a better attempt, although his study of ancient Indian history or archaeology was not of the level that he could make any significant contribution to knowledge. It was, at best, a monograph produced on the basis of secondary sources, but it must be said to the credit of the writer that the scholarship shown in its writing was high enough to induce the Punjab University to undertake its publication.

As for the area of his specialisation, he was fortunate to be initiated into it, at the very outset, by being assigned the task of examining the massive Khalsa Durbar Records preserved in the Punjab Government Secretariat, Lahore. As these primary records related to the annual files of the different departments for a period of thirty-eight years from 1811 to 1849, the greater part of the Khalsa rule, their close examination gave Sita Ram a unique grounding in the subject of his study. The grounding thus gained was subsequently improved by the study of some other primary sources, such as Munshi Sohan Lal's *Umdat-ut-Twarikh*, Dewan Amarnath's *Zafarnama Ranjit Singh*, Ganesh Das's *Fatehnama Guru Khalsa Ji Ka*, *A Book of Military Parwanas*, Shah Muhammad's *Var on the First Anglo-Sikh War*, 1845-46, foreign travellers' and visitors' accounts and British intelligence reports. It was thus on account of his mastery of the original sources that he was considered, on all hands, an authority on the period of the Khalsa rule.

We now proceed to have a critical review of the various works produced by Sita Ram. *Catalogue of Khalsa Durbar Records*, volumes I and II,

was the first work in point of time and may be so even in point of importance. Volume I, published in 1919, contains a summary catalogue of sixty-six bundles of Khalsa Durbar Records pertaining to the military department (Daftar-i-Fauj). There are three categories of these records: (i) brawurd taqsim talab (pay rolls); (ii) jam' kharch (accounts); and (iii) descriptive rolls (chihra). Each category is sub-divided into two parts, one dealing with regular army (Fauj-i-Ain) and the other with irregular cavalry (Fauj-i-Sowari). There are in all four parts in the whole volume. Each part contains a summary catalogue of the various bundles grouped under that particular head. The papers of each bundle have been arranged and catalogued in a serial order, the date of the rolls for each separate unit as well as the total number of folios comprised within each set being also stated. The total strength of the army together with the monthly expenditure on the different arms respectively have been given at five-year intervals. Further details of pay and strength of individual units are given at ten-year intervals. From these statistics one may easily trace the growth and development of the army from period to period. Again, each one of the four parts of the book has been prefaced with a concise account of the main inferences emerging from the scrutiny of the records. The volume thus is much more than a mere catalogue, as it presents a more or less clear picture of the organisation of the Khalsa army, its growth and the administration of its chief branches as well as of the system of maintaining military records of the different kinds.

The army of Ranjit Singh was a very popular subject with the foreign visitors to the Khalsa Durbar during the period of the Maharaja and his successors, and their books are replete with meaningful references to the various arms of the Khalsa military organisation. But when these references are compared with the abundant evidence on the subject made available by Sita Ram in his *Catalogue of the Khalsa Durbar Records*, volume I, we are left with no doubt regarding the tremendous importance of the contribution made by him. Indeed, by it the way has been paved for a deeper probe into the subject. Later on, he himself utilized the newly discovered historical data for attempting a connected account of the army of Ranjit Singh in its various aspects. Between 1922 and 1935 a series of articles of his on the subject were published in the *Journal of Indian History*. To take only a few examples, one of them dealt at length with the artillery organization, tracing its growth from the beginning of its use by the Sikhs down to the close of the period of the Khalsa rule. Among the different aspects covered in it, the most important were: organisation and strength of artillery, karkhanajat (workshops), the mode of casting guns, the method of preparation of the wax used in artillery, structure and working of foundries and naming of guns. Another article of the series discussed the important aspects of the Maharaja's military administration, such as methods of recruitment, procedure on entering the service, descriptive

rolls, pay and allowances, drill and discipline, punishments and pensions. Two more articles in this connection may also be mentioned. One was published in 1940 and was based on "A Book of Military Parwanas", which was a collection of 461 parwanas (letters) addressed by Ranjit Singh between 14 November 1833 and December 1834 to Sardar Tej Singh, General, Campoo-i-Muala (The exalted camp). Unfortunately, the book has not been published, but from the paper written by Sita Ram it is clear how the Maharaja went into minute details in issuing instructions to the marching troops. The other article of the author related to a trained infantry battalion of Hari Singh Nalwa, a chief of the Lahore Durbar. This reveals that the practice of keeping trained infantry battalions modelled on the European system was not confined to the Central government, but was also followed by the important chiefs of the Khalsa Durbar in the organisation of their private or jagirdari forces.

The second volume of the *Catalogue of Khalsa Durbar Records*, published in 1927, related to the Revenue, Jagir and Toshakhana* Daftars (departments) of the Khalsa Durbar. The arrangement followed in this volume is similar to that adopted in volume I. The book has been divided into three parts dealing with revenue rolls, Jagirs and Toshakhana accounts respectively. The first part dealing with revenue matters constitutes the main body of the book and covers 296 out of 315 pages. Next in size is the third part dealing with the Toshakhana accounts, which covers twelve pages. The smallest part is the second which concerns Jagirat and reorganisation of the Talluqas or administrative units. As in the previous volume, each part has been prefaced with a short note giving the outstanding features of the particular department with which it is concerned. Each preface by itself is an exercise in research of a high order and the three put together present a fairly detailed account of the origin, development, organisation and functioning of the civil part of the Central Secretariat of the Lahore Durbar. It may be pointed out that as early as 1918 Sita Ram had published a paper in the *Journal of Indian History* on the land revenue administration under Maharaja Ranjit Singh. What has been incorporated here is thus a continuation and an amplification of that paper.

The kind of analysis of this vital subject made by Sita Ram first in 1919 and then in 1927 could be possible only on the basis of an examination of the original records of the Khalsa Government, and hence his work so far has not been equalled, much less excelled, by anyone else.

* The term Toshakhana has been explained as a store-room, a wardrobe or a chamber where the objects of curiosity or value, not in daily request, were kept. The Toshakhana of Maharaja Ranjit Singh contained all the valuables, jewellery, precious stones, gold and silver ornaments as well as the Khila't pieces and other valuable articles of dress. The important State Papers, such as treaties and documents concerning the foreign relations of the state, were also consigned to the custody of the Toshakhana.

Dewan Amarnath's *Zafarnama-i-Ranjit Singh* is now considered one of the most dependable sources for the period of Ranjit Singh. It was Sita Ram Kohli who discovered its manuscript and after editing it carefully with explanatory notes and an introduction, published it in 1928. About the historical value of this work, Sita Ram writes: "Dewan Amarnath's history is not only not inferior to any contemporary chronicle in point of accuracy of detail, it far excels even the diary of Sohan Lal and the history of Bute Shah in richness of facts of general interest. By virtue of his own position as the Bakshi or paymaster of the irregular cavalry of the Khalsa Government and because of his family connections, our author enjoyed special facilities for collecting valuable material for his narrative. His father, Dewan Dina Nath, was the Finance Minister of Ranjit Singh and as such had the entire charge of the civil, military and political records of the Maharaja's Government. The author was personally acquainted with most of the influential men at the Court and this background of general experience of men and things around him stood him in good stead in writing his history.... The book, is, therefore, a most important original source of information concerning the reign of Ranjit Singh." It is the regret of Sita Ram that Amarnath did not carry his account beyond 1835-36, although he lived through the stormy period of the Sikh rule and till long after the annexation of the Punjab in 1849. The Introduction of Sita Ram for this book contains, besides the note on the historical value of the book, much useful information about Dewan Amarnath and his family and about the title and manuscript copies of the work as also regarding the style of the writer.

Having mastered the important original sources of the period, Sita Ram wrote a book on Maharaja Ranjit Singh which for its authenticity, detail and presentation may easily be regarded as one of the best works on the subject. This was written in Urdu at the instance of the Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, and was published in 1933. After this work was completed, Sita Ram became anxious that its Punjabi version should also be brought out. But before he could take up this job in right earnestness, he was assigned the administrative work of a College Principal. The heavy responsibilities which now devolved upon him left him no time to attend to his literary pursuits and it was not till 1953 that his long-cherished idea of producing a book on Maharaja Ranjit Singh in Punjabi could be fulfilled. Sita Ram's interest in the study of the Maharaja's period was lifelong and he had written many things on the subject, but they were all piecemeal and did not present a complete picture of it. His work on Ranjit Singh in Urdu as well as in Punjabi was his first and only attempt to deal with the subject as a whole. Moreover, it represented the sum and substance of his prolonged deliberation on the subject.

Along with the Persian and English sources that were used by Sita Ram in the preparation of his work on Ranjit Singh, there was one impor-

tant Punjabi, better Hindi, original source written by one Ganesh Dass. The *Fatehnama Guru Khalsa Ji Ka*, as the source was called, was present with him in manuscript form at the time because to this effect a clear indication is given in the Introduction to his Urdu book on Maharaja Ranjit Singh. However, this work of Ganesh Dass was edited and published long after in the year 1952. According to the editor, Ganesh Dass had written it before 1831, and as such it has tremendous historical importance. Its scope is limited to three important events only, namely, the siege of Multan (1818), the battle of Naushehra (1823), and the fighting against Khalifa Syed Ahmad of Bareilly (only the earlier phase), but even so, within the framework of its limited scope it far excels any other contemporary account, indigenous or foreign, in richness of detail, in graphicness of account and in liveliness of presentation. The value of the work has been enhanced by the editor with his footnotes, appendices and a critical introduction explaining its historical importance and the chief features of Ranjit Singh's career and administration.

After the reign of Ranjit Singh, the period that most claimed his attention was the last phase of the Khalsa rule, 1839-49. During this short period of one decade, things moved very fast. Between the death of Ranjit Singh in 1839 and 1845 when the first Anglo-Sikh War broke out, a total of six years only, there were as many as seven changes of government, each accompanied by violence and bloodshed. As the result of these violent revolutions caused at once by internal factions and external intrigues, the central government of the Khalsa Durbar lost its balance and prestige, giving rise to conditions of dangerous political instability in the country. The British victory in the war of 1845-46 gave the winners a firm foothold on the soil of the Punjab. Once this happened, the foreign rulers were quick to exploit their position of strength and within four years of their first entrance in the Punjab, the independence of the Khalsa kingdom was gone and it was made one of the many provinces of the British Empire in India.

Sita Ram Kohli wanted to unravel the mysteries of the pressures and forces which brought on the deluge so soon after the death of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. In fact, his sole preoccupation during the last years of his life was to put forth his mature deliberations on this period in the form of a book. The failing health was a big handicap to him, but in spite of it he carried on his work and completed the manuscript before he died in 1962.

That Sita Ram had started studying the post-Ranjit Singh period of the Khalsa rule quite early in his career is evident from the publication of his monograph *Trial of Mul Raj* as early as 1932. This monograph, no. 14 in the series of monographs published by the Punjab Government, Lahore, puts together all the available papers and documents connected with the trial of Dewan Mul Raj, Sikh Governor of Multan. As the English proceedings of the trial had disappeared in some mysterious manner, Sita

Ram had real difficulty in collecting the relevant papers. In the preface to the book he has explained how he chanced upon some vernacular proceedings at Lahore and how after that, he conducted his search for their corresponding English part, which he found, again by chance, at Calcutta. After comparing the two sets and explaining the discrepancies with foot-notes, he edited them giving a lengthy introduction in the beginning of the book. The records edited here set forth, in his own words, "the circumstances under which the outbreak of Multan took place in April 1848, how the Revolt of Multan developed into the Second Sikh War and how eventually it led to the absorption of the Sikh kingdom into the British Empire in India." For the benefit of the reader, he has written, on the basis of the information given in the trial proceedings, an elaborate introduction which clearly explains the relevant issues. The account closes with the significant observations of John Login, John Lawrence and Lepel Griffin on the degree of Mul Raj's complicity in the revolt. According to these prominent contemporary Englishmen, Mul Raj was a man of timid and vacillating disposition, who lacked the requisite strength of will to resist what he was opposed to at heart and was hence a victim of circumstances rather than a willing party to the happenings that led to the revolt. Strangely enough, Sita Ram does not give any indication which may show his own thinking on the subject. He seems neither to confirm nor to reject the views of the Englishmen mentioned above.

Another edited work of Sita Ram pertaining to the last phase of the Khalsa rule was *Shah Muhammad's Var* (Punjabi) on the first Anglo-Sikh War, which was brought out in 1956. The ballad of Shah Muhammad is commonly known and oft-quoted. Historically, too, it is of immense importance being the Indian side of the picture given by a writer not far removed from the scene of action depicted in the work. But its authenticity has for long remained unverified, so that not unoften doubts have been raised about some statements of the writer, particularly those relating to Rani Jindan. Sita Ram has laboured hard to examine the veracity of the account given in Shah Muhammad's work. The total text of this work covers only 56 half-pages in this book of 204 pages, the other halves of these pages being filled with footnotes, whereas the Introduction alone runs into 119 pages. Among the different aspects discussed in the Introduction, the principal ones are concerned with the gradual weakening of the Khalsa state after the death of Ranjit Singh, circumstances leading to the outbreak of hostilities between the Sikhs and the British, various battles of the war, and historical and literary value of Shah Muhammad's writings. After a thorough examination of the work, the editor has arrived at the conclusion that despite the personal opinions of the writer, there is nothing historically incorrect in his work.

The editing of the two above-mentioned books, *Shah Muhammad's Var* and *Trial of Mul Raj*, afforded Sita Ram the opportunity of recording his

thoughts on the entire post-Ranjit Singh phase of ten years—up to the first Anglo-Sikh War in the first book and after that up to the end of the Sikh kingdom, 1849, in the second. But from the point of view of the interplay of diverse forces during this period, his writings were sketchy and inadequate. Naturally, therefore, he felt persuaded, as previously in the case of Ranjit Singh's reign he had felt, to attempt a connected and comprehensive study of the period as a whole. Thus the last years of his life were devoted, almost exclusively, to this work, and he was able to complete the job despite his poor health, but before he could send it to the press, he died. The manuscript was, after his death, edited by Khushwant Singh and published in 1967 under the title, *Sunset of the Sikh Empire*, which is the editor's substitute for the author's title *The Last Phase, 1839-1849*. Though, essentially, this is the author's own work, the chapter dealing with the battles of the Second Anglo-Sikh War has been taken ad verbum from the editor's own book *Fall of the Kingdom of the Punjab*, the relevant chapter of the author being found missing.

The posthumous book of Sita Ram Kohli solves some of the knotty problems of the period immediately following the death of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, particularly those connected with the deaths of Kharak Singh, Nau Nihal Singh and Chand Kaur, and the killings of Maharaja Sher Singh and his Prime Minister Raja Dhian Singh. Similarly, the annexation of the Punjab to the British Empire has been put in a much better historical perspective as compared with other published works on the subject. The period between the two Sikh Wars, however, has received, comparatively speaking, much less scholarly attention and hence does not come up to level with the period preceding it. But the major weakness of the work lies in its being a more or less one-sided study, laying emphasis as it does mostly on the internal pressures and factors. The study is, no doubt, interspersed with references to British machinations in regard to the Punjab, but these references do not add up to being a scientific analysis of the changes in the British foreign policy from the thirties of the nineteenth century onwards.

We have had above a brief idea of the work done by Sita Ram Kohli. That it was considerable will be readily conceded by any fair-minded student of history. But most of it is editing work, from which it may be inferred that he was more of an editor than an original writer, and justifiably so, because he had to begin from a scratch and hence was faced, from the outset, with the problem of dearth of authentic source books. Therefore, for him, if he wanted to venture into the field of research in Punjab history, there were two immediate problems: (i) discovery of new sources; (ii) authentication of new discoveries. The Persian chronicle of Sohan Lal, known as *Umdat-ut-Twarikh*, was admitted on all hands to be a first-rate source for the period of the Sikh kingdom and there was no need of editing it. The Khalsa Durbar records available at the civil secretariat

of the Punjab Government in numerous bundles were another primary source about the authenticity of which there was no doubt. But they had to be brought into public gaze, if they were to be useful for research. Hence, they had to be properly catalogued. This work was creditably accomplished by Sita Ram after many years of arduous labour. This experience, however, strengthened the urge in him to explore other possible historical sources of the period. What results followed from his efforts, have already been noticed in our brief survey of his work in the foregoing pages.

In editing the source books he was always very careful and painstaking. His good linguistic equipment stood him in good stead in reading and comparing the texts of his manuscripts. Invariably, he gave footnotes, glossary of technical terms, appendices and introduction throwing light on the manuscript in hand, its historical and literary value and if possible, on the author as well. But his introductions were, in most cases, very lengthy and contained material which was repetitious and could as well have been avoided without any damage to the utility of the work. For instance, a brief account of Ranjit Singh's career of conquests and administration finds place in almost all his edited works, there being no material difference between one account and another. This, instead of adding to the value of his editing, has added some unnecessary length to his introductions. Furthermore, in assessing the historical importance of manuscripts, he just stops with the preliminary inquiries about the identity of the author and about the date and general importance of the work. He does not go deep and discuss the subject matter, so that the general approach of the writer as well as the extent of the contribution made by him remain practically untouched.

The constant preoccupation of Sita Ram with the editing of newly discovered sources left him little time to pursue the writing of original books. He wrote in 1933 a history of Ranjit Singh in Urdu at the instance of the Hindustani Academy, Lahore, but failed to follow it up. The result was that the Punjabi version of the Maharaja's biography, on which he was all along so keen, could not be brought out till twenty years later in 1953. Thereafter, he started working on the *Last Phase, 1839-1849*. In his own words which he uttered to Khushwant Singh during the latter's visit to him in the summer of 1962, he had been working on the new book for the last ten years. It was not a huge project which required so many years, but the slow progress may be explained by his reduced capacity for work due to his protracted disease of asthma. In the opening paragraph of the first chapter of this book, now published, he mentions his original intention to write a comprehensive history of the rise, progress and fall of the kingdom of the Punjab, of which this book was to form the last volume. He has blamed the failure to carry out his intention on his other preoccupations and his indifferent state of health. This explanation of Sita Ram may not be questioned, but a more valid cause of his inability to translate his

intention into reality seems to be that his love for editing of historical material outstepped his zeal for original historical writing.

As a historical thinker and writer, the approach of Sita Ram was characterised by logicality, balance of mind and intellectual honesty. He seldom indulged in surmises and generally left his facts to speak for themselves. He was not given to making any statement which was not warranted by reliable historical evidence. Logical thinking gave flow and readability to his style and balance of mind largely kept his mind free from the sinister influence of personal prejudices and sentiments. It was not his habit to select the convenient and reject the inconvenient facts, as the pleader of a cause does. On the contrary, he weighed, like a judge, both the sides of the matter before arriving at any conclusion. He was not cast in the polemical mould and in his writing was always at pains to avoid controversies. But in his mind he carefully weighed the different points of view, evolved his own thinking on them and then expressed his matured opinion without denouncing any particular individual or viewpoint. But he was no philosopher and has not written anything on concepts of history. If anything, he held the main aim of a historical researcher to be the search for truth. He possessed an analytical mind which always tried to probe things, whether they were political events or institutions. This quality of his mind gave a certain amount of depth to his writings. Moreover, the clarity of thought which springs from analytical and logical thinking enabled him to avoid confusion and to be precise and to the point in his historical statements. However, it may be said that even his analytical mind did not penetrate far below the surface. The diverse forces which shaped the society and powerfully operated behind the historical events and institutions, which threw up Ranjit Singh to a position of power and glory for a short period and then dragged down the entire superstructure raised by him in the brief span of ten years, were not taken any notice of. Similarly, he failed to comprehend the inner mechanism of the British foreign policy, which was a major factor in the disintegration and final extinction of the independent kingdom of the Punjab.

But this is not to belittle his contribution to historical knowledge, which is tremendous. His work on the Khalsa Durbar records, by itself, is monumental. It is a measure of his great achievement that it stands where he left it, and nobody since then has dared to resume it. His discovery and editing of some important new sources is also an important contribution. His original works may not be as great contributions, but in attempting them he did blaze a trail to guide other writers on the subject. Particularly, his study of the military and administrative institutions of the Khalsa rule is a great feat of scholarship and his contribution in this respect will always be remembered. Thereby, he has laid down the foundation on which the edifice of advanced research may be built by

subsequent researchers. He was essentially a pioneer—and a very competent one—and it will be as well if his work is assessed as that of a pioneer. It is in this particular sense that he has been often and ought to be called, by way of tribute, a doyen of Punjab historians of the last generation.

INDUBHUSAN BANERJEE

DR. ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE

(Jadavpur University, Calcutta)

THE late Professor Indubhusan Banerjee belonged to a highly respectable and cultured Brahmin family of Vikrampur *pargana* in the district of Dacca (now in Bangladesh). He was born in November, 1893, at Mekliganj in the Princely State of Cooch Behar, now a district in West Bengal, where his father, the late Bhagabati Charan Banerjee, was an officer in the State Education Department. He passed the Matriculation examination of the Calcutta University in 1910 from the Kishori Lal Jubilee High School in the town of Dacca and then studied for six years in Dacca College, which was then the premier educational institution in East Bengal and was affiliated to Calcutta University. He graduated from Dacca College with second class Honours in History in 1914 and took his M.A. in History from the same institution in 1916 in the first class, topping the list of successful candidates. In 1921 he secured the Premchand Roychand Studentship, one of the highest academic distinctions offered by Calcutta University, for his researches in Sikh history. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred upon him by the Calcutta University in 1939.

In 1917 Sir Asutosh Mookerjee established the Post-Graduate Departments in Arts and Sciences for promoting post-graduate studies and researches in different branches of learning under the direct control of the Calcutta University. For the Department of History he selected young and promising scholars like Ramesh Chandra Majumdar, Surendra Nath Sen and Indubhusan Banerjee. Sir Asutosh made special provision for the teaching of Maratha history, Rajput history and Sikh history. The last mentioned subject was entrusted to Indubhusan Banerjee who joined the University as a lecturer in History in December, 1917. After long years of devoted service he rose to be Reader and Head of the Department. He was appointed Asutosh Professor of Medieval and Modern Indian History in 1948 as successor of Surendra Nath Sen. He retired from service in 1955.

The subjects which he taught in the post-graduate classes included, apart from Sikh history which he had made his own, the history of modern Bengal and of ancient Egypt. He had a deeply religious temperament and a severe philosophical view of life. This explains his deep interest in, and understanding of, religious history. His interpretation of ancient Egyptian religion will be remembered long by his pupils. His exposition of the religious history of the Sikhs has received a permanent shape in his most important book.

Professor Banerjee thought much more than he wrote; he hated to present to the world of scholarship hastily collected facts and ill-digested conclusions. His principal works are the two volumes of *Evolution of the Khalsa*, and a monograph on the early period of British rule in Bengal entitled *The Supreme Court in Conflict*. He published some interesting papers in the *Bengal Past and Present* and the *Calcutta Review*. His Presidential Address at the Modern Section of the Indian History Congress, Annamalainagar session (1945), was published in its *Proceedings*. He might have made other contributions of abiding value if he had been spared for some years after his retirement from University service; but the end came too soon, quite unexpectedly, on November 13, 1956.

As a man, Professor Banerjee has left in the minds of his friends and pupils a memory of sweet cordiality, of deep but unostentatious sympathy, and of strong but silent moral influence. He belonged to that vanishing generation of devoted scholars who accepted the advancement of learning as the mission of life and pursued it irrespective of prospects of worldly advancement.

The first volume of Professor Banerjee's *Evolution of the Khalsa* was published in 1936; the second volume followed in 1947. The first volume was dedicated to 'the revered memory of Sir Asutosh Mookerjee at whose instance' the author "took up investigations in Sikh History." The first draft was made within three years of his appointment as a lecturer in the University and it won for him the much coveted Premchand Roychand Studentship. But it was published fifteen years later, primarily because he wished to collect new materials, to formulate fresh conclusions in the light of his developing ideas, and to give his narrative a finished literary form. He was not a scholar in a hurry. He took another ten years to give his second volume its final form and even then he was not satisfied. "I have not been able," he said in the Preface, "to bring it out in a form in which I would have liked it to appear."

In these two volumes the author set himself (to quote his own words) to "the task of tracing the evolution of Sikhism till Guru Gobind Singh introduced his reforms and brought the Khalsa into existence." For the sake of convenience he split up the work in two volumes. The first volume covered the period till 1604 when the *Granth Sahib* was compiled and the peaceful evolution of Sikhism practically came to an end. His ambition was a modest one; he would consider himself "amply rewarded", he stated in his Preface, if his book, "in some measure, paves the way to further discussion and clarification." The second volume covers two of the greatest tragedies of Sikh history; it begins with the execution of Guru Arjan and concludes with the murder of Guru Gobind Singh. It seems that Professor Banerjee selected the period of the Gurus for a critical study because he regarded it, rightly, as the germinal period of Sikh history. Moreover, his

religious temperament and philosophical outlook qualified him specially for meaningful interpretation of religious history.

In assessing the value of Professor Banerjee's contribution to Sikh studies we must remember that he was really a pioneer. The first English writer on the subject was Browne, the East India Company's representative at the court of the puppet Mughal Emperor Shah Alam II, whose *India Tracts* was published in 1788. Professor Banerjee observes: "The value of the work, so far as ea 'ly Sikh history is concerned, would become apparent if we quote the author as our authority for stating that Guru Arjan was succeeded by Ram Rai and that in 1662 a son, named Tegh Bahadur, was born to Harkrishan." Forster, who travelled through the Punjab in 1783-84, included in his *A Journey from Bengal to England* (published in 1798) a short sketch about the Sikhs; but it is "of little practical value" (to quote Professor Banerjee) so far as the earlier phase of Sikhism is concerned. Malcolm's *Sketch of the Sikhs*, based on several historical tracts in the Punjabi language, "appears to have been written carelessly and does not help us much." Macgregor (*History of the Sikhs*, 1846) made the first attempt to write a connected history of the Sikhs, but it was found by Professor Banerjee to be "hopelessly out of date." Then followed Cunningham (*History of the Sikhs*, 1849), the first really careful and conscientious historian of the Sikhs. But his earlier chapters were based on inadequate and uncritical material, and provided no trustworthy account of the development of Sikhism under the direct guidance of the Gurus. After the fall of the Sikh State Trumpp prepared an English translation of the *Adi Granth* (1877) under the auspices of the India Office which was, according to Macauliffe, "highly inaccurate and unidiomatic, and furthermore gave mortal offence to the Sikhs by the *Odium theologicum* introduced into it." But Trumpp's Introductory Essays, particularly his translation of the old *Janamsakhi*, Professor Banerjee found to be "still useful" if handled with caution.

The modern phase of Sikh studies began really with the publication (1909) of Macauliffe's monumental six-volume work, *The Sikh Religion, its Gurus, Sacred Writings and their Authors*. One of his main objects was, as he himself said, "to make some reparation to the Sikhs for the insults which Trumpp offered to their Gurus and their religion." He deliberately adopted the role of an uncriticial narrator; he wrote, as he frankly stated, "from an orthodox Sikh point of view, without any criticism or expression of opinion of his own." While acknowledging his indebtedness to Macauliffe's work, Professor Banerjee says: "...his accounts of the Gurus have suffered greatly.... There has been no attempt to discriminate between fact and fiction, contemporary and infinitely more reliable evidence has been mixed up with later myths and, on the whole, the accounts have emerged, more or less, as a jumble in which legendary matter predominates." In recent years Macauliffe's translation of the hymns in the *Adi Granth* has been

found to be unsatisfactory in many places and a full and more accurate translation of the holy book by Dr. Gopal Singh has been published.

Macauliffe's great service to Sikh studies was that he prepared the ground for a comprehensive study of the early phase of Sikhism by placing at the disposal of scholars an elaborate collection of Sikh traditions. G. C. Narang's *Transformation of Sikhism* (1912) was the first venture along this track. Professor Banerjee found it to be "interesting in its own way but superficial." Teja Singh's *Growth of Responsibility in Sikhism* as also his careful English translation of *Asa di Var* threw new light on the growth of the Sikh community under the Gurus; but these were cursory studies of certain aspects of the early phase of Sikh history, not a full and balanced account.

Professor Banerjee was the first modern historian to attempt a full, comprehensive and critical reconstruction of the development of Sikhism from the days of Guru Nanak to those of Guru Gobind Singh. It goes without saying that he did not share the anti-Sikh bias which had detracted from the value of Trumpp's work and offended the religious sentiment of the Sikh community. On the other hand, both as a historian and as an individual, he had profound respect for the Sikh Gurus and their teachings. Moreover, he felt that it was not possible to understand Sikhism without attaching the greatest importance to what the Sikhs had to say about it. He remembered Malcolm's words: "In every research into the general history of mankind, it is of the most essential importance to hear what a nation has to say of itself...." References to Macauliffe are so frequent in his volumes that the reader is left in no doubt about his understanding and appreciation of the traditional Sikh point of view. But his criticism of Macauliffe, quoted above, shows that he did not surrender his critical judgement—the historian's greatest asset—and allow himself to be infected by unprofessional zeal. His conclusions might not commend themselves to some other careful students of the period, but he never made a statement on the basis of a tradition without scrutinising it in the light of other sources and of reason. He laid a track for others in respect of rational treatment of Sikh history in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Reconstruction of the biography of the Sikh Gurus involved a peculiar difficulty which Malcolm explained in the following words: "There is no part of original biography in which it is more difficult to separate truth from falsehood, than that which relates to the history of religious impostors. The account of their lives is generally recorded, either by devoted disciples and warm adherents, or by violent enemies and bigoted persecutors. The former, from enthusiastic admiration, decorate them with every quality and accomplishment that can adorn men; the latter misrepresent their characters and detract from all their merits and pretensions. This general remark I have found to apply with peculiar force to the varying accounts given, by Sikh and Muhammedan authors, of Nanac and his successor." Writing about the Sikh sources dealing with the biography of Guru Nanak

Professor Banerjee observes: "Our position is...a desperate one and ...though there might be a very interesting study on the biographies of Guru Nanak, we have hardly any material for a satisfactory biography on critical lines. Indeed, when the attempt is made 'to get rid of the fable mixed up with the Sikh legends, and to work the residue of fact into some sort of historical order', difficulties crop up at almost every step." These difficulties he sought to solve primarily through a critical analysis of the Sikh sources, and the outline of the first Guru's life prepared by him more than thirty years ago has survived subsequent research. In the case of Guru Nanak "enthusiastic admiration" of "devoted disciples and warm adherents" created stories of miracles which were unacceptable to the scrupulous historian. In the case of Guru Tegh Bahadur there was misrepresentation of character by anti-Sikh writers. According to Ghulam Hussain, author of the *Siyar-ul-Mutakhkharin*, Guru Tegh Bahadur "united his concerns" with a Muslim *faqir*, and "forsaking every honest calling, they fell to subsisting by plunder and rapine, laying waste the whole province of Pendjab." This statement formed the basis of what Cunningham and Trumpp wrote later about the ninth Guru. Professor Banerjee found it "difficult to accept the statement of a writer, who wrote more than a hundred years after the event, and whose story that the Guru was executed as a disturber of the public peace and as an aspirant to power finds no corroboration elsewhere." He preferred Macauliffe's view and came to the conclusion that "the Guru fell a victim to religious bigotry and...later Muhammadan writers sought to cloud the issue by giving it a political colour." Thus he escaped the two difficulties mentioned by Malcolm by maintaining an objective attitude towards stories of all kinds.

In his first volume Professor Banerjee devotes three chapters to Guru Nanak, dealing with his age, his life, and his message. These are prefaced by an introductory chapter dealing with "several features of exceptional interest" in the history of Sikhism. After discussing such questions as the differences between the Sikhs and the adherents of other medieval *Bhakti* cults and the influence of race on religion Professor Banerjee sounds a note of warning against "any tendency towards over-simplification"; he was not prepared to perpetuate "the fraud of history made easy." The importance of Sociology as a factor explaining historical development had not been recognised in his days, nor had the different aspects of the medieval *Bhakti* movement been studied in detail. Had Professor Banerjee been alive today, his introductory chapter would probably have been written in a different manner and given us greater insight into the history of Sikhism from the standpoint of Sociology and Comparative Religion.

Professor Banerjee is on firm ground in his review of Guru Nanak's age, life, and message. His summary of political developments in North India from the invasion of Timur to the establishment of Mughal rule by Babur is naturally based on Muslim sources. References to Sikandar Lodi's policy

of religious intolerance provide the background for Guru Nanak's message of harmony and tolerance. "The Kal Age is a knife, Kings are butchers"; this pregnant statement of the Guru reveals the terror which clouded the lives of his contemporaries. The Guru had no sympathy for "the dogs of Lodi" who "spoiled the priceless inheritance," nor did he excuse Babur for the acts of devastation which accompanied his march through the Punjab. Professor Banerjee gives us a graphic picture of political degeneration as a background for his analysis of degradation in religious and social life. His argument is sustained by revealing quotations from Guru Nanak's hymns. The reader feels convinced that he does not exaggerate when he says: "...at the time of Guru Nanak's advent, religion there was none."

In reconstructing the story of Guru Nanak's life Professor Banerjee had to rely exclusively upon Sikh traditions unsupported by contemporary and semi-contemporary Hindu and Muslim sources. He sums up his difficulties by saying that "the materials which we possess are scanty where reliable, and unreliable when abundant." The author of the latest book on Guru Nanak, Dr. McLeod, has not found himself in any better position. Apart from "the few vague references in Guru Nanak's hymns to possible incidents in his life" there is no contemporary account; the *Var* of Bhai Gurdas was written not much more than sixty years after the Guru's death, but, as Macauliffe points out, he "did not write a complete life of the Guru." Professor Banerjee's critical discussion on the *Janamsakhis* illustrates his methodology. The only two definitely known dates are those of Guru Nanak's birth and death, and, as Professor Banerjee says, "throughout the huge interval of about seventy years we have to grope in the dark as best as we can with the assistance of the dim, reflected light of one or two independent references." Yet he has succeeded in giving us a fairly complete and convincing sketch of the biography of the first Guru, and it is a well deserved tribute to his historical judgement to say that his conclusions have not been materially shaken by recent researches.

So far as the story of Guru Nanak's wanderings is concerned, Professor Banerjee rightly rejects Trumpp's "unduly gloomy view of the matter", but the evidence available in his time did not make it possible for him to clarify all obscure points. As a matter of fact, a full and consistent account of the Guru's travels in India and in other countries is not available even today. Epigraphic evidence relating to the Guru's visit to Baghdad, utilised by Professor Banerjee, has recently been given a different interpretation by Dr. McLeod, but a recent archaeological discovery in Ceylon supports the tradition of his visit to the island. The chronology of the travels remains confusing; we do not know when the *udasi* period in the Guru's career came to an end and he settled as a householder at Kartarpur.

Describing Guru Nanak's message as "a message of truth and a message of peace" Professor Banerjee leads his reader to the conclusion that the founder of Sikhism was a reformer and not a revolutionary. "He was out

not to kill but to heal, not to destroy but to conserve." There are Sikh writers who take a different view, but it is difficult to disagree with Professor Banerjee if one analyses the Guru's teaching in its contemporary setting instead of making a retrospective appraisal. It is doubtful whether those social customs, religious beliefs and organisational peculiarities which cut off the Sikhs from the general body of Hindus and converted them into a distinct community, began to develop in Guru Nanak's time or could be traced directly to his teaching. Professor Banerjee does not accept the "sweeping conclusion" that Guru Nanak attempted total abolition of the caste system and rejects a literal interpretation of the well-known statement of Bhai Gurdas: "Guru Nanak had reduced the four castes into one." He criticises the view that Guru Nanak eschewed altogether current Hindu customs such as pilgrimages. His comments on the place of Hindu divinities in the *Japji* are interesting and instructive. He contests the view that the Guru had totally rejected the sacred books like the Vedas, the Puranas and the Quran. His position may be stated in his own words: "Most of the difficulties about interpreting the message of Guru Nanak arise from the fundamental assumptions that he had brought about something entirely novel and that all the later developments in Sikhism were implicit in his teachings...to insist on the latter contention is to take a view of history which can hardly be historical and as regards the former it can be shown that of the various features of Sikhism, taken separately, there are not many which we do not come across in the past history of Hinduism." How Sikhism developed into an independent creed with its own theology and organisation is explained in detail in the chapters dealing with the later Gurus.

From the organisational point of view, the most important step taken by Guru Nanak was the nomination of Angad as his successor, which Professor Banerjee rightly regards as "a fact of the profoundest significance in Sikh history." This succession marked the first cleavage between the Hindus and the Sikhs; "it placed the movement under the guidance and control of a definite and indisputable leadership and gave it a distinctive turn at the very outset of its career." Guru Angad "adopted and modified" the *Landa* script which was then used in the Punjab for writing the vernacular and called it *Gurumukhi*, thus giving it "a characteristically Sikh name together with the seal of religious sanctity." He initiated the process which led to the compilation of the *Adi Granth*. He "enlarged and expanded" the "characteristic Sikh institution of the Langar" which had already been set on foot by Guru Nanak. These measures saved the Sikhs from "total absorption by the Hindu mass."

From "the supernatural myths and the anticipatory legends that abound in the Sikh chronicles" Professor Banerjee draws some "sober facts" indicating the importance of the leadership of Guru Amar Das in the evolution of the Sikh *Panth*. The foundation of the *Bawali* at Goindwal

provided for the Sikhs a centre of pilgrimage. Sikhism attracted so many converts—including Muslims—that the Guru found it necessary to "divide the Sikh spiritual empire into 22 bishoprics" or *manji*. There was a split with the *Udasis*; reforms in certain religious and social customs widened the gulf between the Sikhs and the Hindus. The foundations of Amritsar were laid by Guru Ram Das and the work was completed by his son and successor, Guru Arjan. As the number of the Sikhs was increasing Guru Arjan introduced the *masand* system for collection of gifts. "The dues of the Gurus were paid more readily and unfailingly than even the Mughal revenues." This system stabilised the finances of the Sikh organisation; what was more significant, the "Sikhs were gradually accustomed to a kind of government of their own, and began to feel themselves as a firmly organised and strong party within the State." These words of Trumpp are quoted with approval by Professor Banerjee.

Professor Banerjee's chapter entitled "Foundation of the Sikh Panth" gives us a clear picture of the different stages through which the four successors of Guru Nanak carried their disciples till they formed an integrated socio-religious brotherhood with a Guru, a central place of pilgrimage (Amritsar), a code of ideas and conduct, and a sacred book. The compilation of the sacred book "furnished the coping-stone to Guru Arjan's strenuous work of organisation." His efforts to foster trade and industry among the Sikhs are dismissed by Professor Banerjee with a passing reference, although the growing strength of the new community found a solid basis in economic enterprise.

The last chapter of the first volume deals with "Ideals and Institutions." Professor Banerjee is practically silent on the metaphysical aspects of Sikhism which, in a passing remark, he identifies with "the Vedanta of the Vaisnavite brand." While recognising Guru Nanak's contact with Muslim *faqirs* he rejects Carpenter's contention that the founder of Sikhism "attempted to establish a religion combining the higher elements of Hinduism and Islam alike." Instead of discussing the question he expressed his intention to return to it "in a separate monograph", but this promise was not fulfilled. In the above-mentioned chapter he explains the concept of Guruship in Sikhism and the allied concepts of *Name*, *Word* and brotherhood. He shows how the Guru "came to occupy the position of a sole and supreme religious teacher." His observations do not constitute a mere historical narrative; he could practically soak himself in the spirit of *Gur-bani* because devotion to religion and philosophy was an abiding feature of his own life and thought.

The 17th century was the period of conflict between the Sikh *Panth* and the Mughal *Imperialism*. This conflict forms the subject-matter of Professor Banerjee's second volume. By the year 1604 the position acquired by the Sikh community was "that of a separate polity within the Mughal Empire" and this "could not but disturb the equanimity of the establi-hed

State." Sir Jadunath Sarkar ignored the basic antagonism between the Sikh *Panth* and the Mughal State and dismissed the execution of Guru Arjan by Jahangir as a case of "customary punishment of a political offender." Professor Banerjee quotes an extract from Jahangir's *Tuzuk* to show that it was basically a case of religious persecution. Guru Arjan's political offence was a minor one. To quote Jahangir's own words: "He behaved to Khusrav in certain special ways, and made on his forehead a finger-mark in saffron, which the Indians (Hinduwan) call *qashqa* and is considered propitious." This could hardly be treated as participation in the prince's rebellion and as an offence deserving capital punishment. Jahangir's real purpose was to put a stop to what he himself called the Sikh Guru's "Nain affair", i.e. propaganda and conversion, "or to bring him into the assembly of the people of Islam." Neither of these purposes was fulfilled. Guru Arjan courted death, and from this tragic incident commenced the struggle which, to quote Trumpp, "changed the entire character of the reformatory religious movement." Instead of surrendering their faith the Sikhs fortified themselves for resistance.

The next phase of Mughal persecution was the imprisonment of Guru Arjan's son and successor, Guru Hargobind. After his release he found it politically wise to maintain friendly relations with the Mughal Government, although he could not avoid some armed clashes during the early years of Shahjahan's reign. No open confrontation with the mighty Mughal Government was possible, but Guru Hargobind took cautious steps for militarising the Sikhs so that they could use arms for defensive purposes. He initiated the process which reached its culmination under the leadership of Guru Gobind Singh. Professor Banerjee's reconstruction of the career and policy of Guru Hargobind illustrates his skill and judgement in the use of scanty and obscure historical material. The large-scale conversion of the warlike Jats of the *Manjha* tract had imperceptibly brought a martial spirit into the Sikh community; the policy of non-resistance that Guru Amar Das had adopted towards his aggressive and intolerant Muslim neighbours was not quite compatible with their temperament. Guru Hargobind noted and utilised this change in the character of the Sikh community; he initiated the policy of defensive militarism in order to meet the new situation created by the hostility of the Mughal State. The role of the Jats in the transformation of the initially peaceful Sikh community into Guru Gobind Singh's *Khalsa* is a subject which Professor Banerjee is a pioneer in taking up for critical investigation.

Moderation was the chief characteristic of the policy pursued by Guru Hargobind's two successors, Guru Har Rai and Guru Har Krishan. The former, indeed, maintained a small army and a court displaying "the pomp and circumstances of a semi-independent military chieftain"; but he avoided open conflict with the Mughal State. History, however, repeated itself; he implicated himself in the war of succession on the side of

Dara and, like his great-grandfather Guru Arjan, exposed himself to punishment for treason. Though Aurangzib was far more intolerant than Jahangir, he seems to have considered it politically unwise to antagonise the Sikhs immediately after his accession. He tried to win over the Guru's eldest son, Ram Rai, who was virtually a hostage in the Mughal court. Ram Rai offended his father by his anxiety to please the Emperor. He was disinherited. His younger brother, Har Krishan, succeeded to the Guruship when he was barely six years old. He was summoned to Delhi where he died prematurely after three years of formal Guruship.

The uneasy truce between the *Panth* and the Empire came to an end with Aurangzib's cruel blow, viz. the execution of Guru Tegh Bahadur. As we have pointed out above, there are two contradictory versions of the ninth Guru's character—Sikh and Muslim—which Professor Banerjee analyses with remarkable objectivity. He comes to the conclusion that it was religious bigotry rather than political necessity which lay behind Aurangzib's policy.

The situation in which the Sikhs now found themselves resembled the crisis which had threatened to overwhelm them after the execution of Guru Arjan. The major part of Professor Banerjee's second volume deals with Guru Gobind Singh's remarkable career and achievement. No summary can do justice to the patience, skill and discrimination with which he extracts sober facts from confused and legendary details about his relations with the Mughal Government and the Hill Rajas. Of far greater and more abiding importance is his interpretation of Guru Gobind Singh's reform of Sikh religion and organisation. He makes full use of the *Bachitra Natak* and adds an English version of those parts of the work which Macauliffe left untranslated.

The tenth Guru's idea about his mission as also the objects that he sought to achieve is clearly and even emphatically stated in the *Bachitra Natak*. He resumed birth, he says, "for the purpose of spreading the faith, saving the saints and extirpating all tyrants." The methods of peace, the Guru felt, were no longer adequate; the assistance of the "Holy Sword" was needed for destroying the armies of the wicked. "God subdues enemies, so does the Sword; therefore the Sword is God and God is the Sword." This is the background of the making of the *Khalsa*.

Professor Banerjee raises a very important question: Did the *Khalsa* arise "logically and naturally out of the foundation laid by Guru Nanak and his immediate successors," or was it "a superimposition which utilised the foundations for an entirely different purpose"? In his view, the tenth Guru did not give up the essentials of Guru Nanak's teaching, but "it would be idle to deny that in the Khalsa we breathe a new spirit." He goes back to the sociological interpretation of the transformation of Sikhism under Guru Hargobind and says that Guru Gobind Singh "united the religious fervour of the Sikh with the warlike temper of the Jat." Taken as a whole, the

tenth Guru's reforms reorganised the Sikhs "within the tightest of limits" and made the community "more sectarian in character." On these grounds Professor Banerjee is inclined to support the view that the free and untrammelled growth of the Sikhs was arrested by the creation of the *Khalsa*. But he recognises the compulsion of events which led Guru Gobind Singh in that direction. The large-scale entry of the Jats into the Sikh community had affected the peaceful character of the brotherhood nourished by the early Gurus. The second factor was the "hostile environment" which developed in the 17th century. The spiritual-cum-temporal leadership which emerged in the days of Guru Arjan, and was inherited by Guru Gobind Singh, could not ignore the realities, internal and external. The latter's constructive genius reinterpreted the teachings of the early Gurus in the light of new conditions and "forged a dynamic force which none could henceforward ignore."

Professor Banerjee tells us that "Guru Gobind Singh must be counted among the greatest of Indians of all ages" and challenges Sir Jadunath Sarkar's attempt to "belittle the achievements of the Sikhs." After Guru Gobind Singh's death the Sikhs had, as Trumpp says, "no other choice but to conquer or to be conquered." It was not the tenth Guru but the Mughal Emperors who had pushed them into that dangerous position. It was Guru Gobind Singh's great achievement to prepare the Sikhs for the grim struggle which awaited them in the 18th century. Their success in that struggle and the emergence of a Sikh State testify to the fruitful and enduring character of the Guru's work. Professor Banerjee says: "To our mind the Khalsa's greatest contribution to the cause of India was the wresting of the Punjab and the adjoining lands up to the frontier from the clutches of the Afghans. It is not improbable that if they had not done so, some of these tracts might have been lost, even geographically, to India as some other tracts had been in the past."

Professor Banerjee throws new light on the mystery of the murder of Guru Gobind Singh. He rejects the tradition that the attack on the Guru was self-invited on the ground that "the Sikhs who regarded the Guru as an instrument of God and sometimes, against the express injunctions of the Guru, even as an incarnation, could hardly reconcile themselves to the fact that Guru Gobind Singh had fallen a victim to the dagger of an assassin." He considers it much more likely that the murderous attack on the Guru was instigated by Wazir Khan of Sarhind who had been unnerved by the Guru's friendly relations with the new Emperor, Bahadur Shah.

In reviewing the first volume, *The Statesman* made an interesting observation. "The historian's preoccupation with details," it said, was rarely "coupled with a philosopher's desire for a synoptic vision." It continued: "The two temperaments are indeed rarely found in the same person: where they are, the virtues of the metaphysician often appear as

the vices of the historian, as notably in David Hume. Here at least we have a happy union of the two disciplines."

"The historian's preoccupation with details" is much more in evidence in Professor Banerjee's *The Supreme Court in Conflict* than in his *Evolution of the Khalsa*. Two aspects of the historic quarrel between the Supreme Court and the Supreme Council, viz., the Court's assumption of temporary jurisdiction over the Zamindars and its interference with the Nizamat, are treated in detail. In his Preface Professor Banerjee "begs the reader to regard the present work as a preliminary clearing of the ground for a fuller and more ambitious work" giving "a complete account of the quarrel in all its details", but he left that task unattempted. The monograph, however, provides sufficient material for a clear understanding of one of the most complex problems arising out of the ill-drafted provisions of the Regulating Act.

"In the Introduction the background has been clearly set, so that the reader may have no difficulty in following the narrative and the argument." Taking the assumption of the *Dewani* by the Company as his starting point Professor Banerjee proceeds to narrate the circumstances necessitating Parliamentary legislation in 1773. He says: "The constitution originally designed for a purely mercantile Company was breaking down under the stress of new and unforeseen responsibilities. The acquisition of territorial revenues had completely changed the character of the Company and brought in the question of sovereignty; on the other hand, it had opened to the Company's servants in India wide opportunities of personal profit and aggrandisement, which were being utilised in the most unscrupulous and nefarious ways." The situation demanded drastic remedies and the Regulating Act sought to provide them; but, as Professor Banerjee points out, "defects of drafting obscured the real intentions of the Act, and the situation was further aggravated by the more or less uncompromising attitude of the Majority (in the Council) on the one hand and the equal obduracy of (Justices) Le Maistre and Hyde on the other." After several years of quarrel, during which both parties talked of principles but indulged in personal rancour, a Parliamentary Select Committee, known as Touchet Committee, was appointed. It submitted a report in 1781. An Act was then passed, upholding almost all the contentions of the Council.

The four Appendices to the Report of Tuchet's Committee form the basis of Professor Banerjee's study. These valuable documents had previously been utilised by Sir James Stephen in his well-known work, *The Story of Nuncomar and the Impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey*. But his treatment of the Court-Council quarrel is, Professor Banerjee says, "inadequate" and "he approaches the question primarily from the strictly legal and technical standpoint." It was natural for an eminent lawyer to emphasize the legal and technical aspects of a problem which had its origin in differing interpretations of an Act of Parliament. But no study of the problem could be

really satisfactory unless the historical context as also personal factors were given due weight. As Professor Banerjee says, "an action may be legally correct but at the same time it may be politically inexpedient or even morally wrong." His interpretation corrects and supplements Sir James Stephen's legalistic approach.

Chapter II deals with "The Supreme Court and the Zamindars." As Professor Banerjee says, "The Council took its stand on political necessity, and the Court on law as they understood it." He complains that Sir James Stephen's view is based on "a cursory study of the points involved in the Kasijora Case alone" without "a close analysis of the background." He discusses several other cases, shows how not only zamindars but also their servants suffered from the Processes of the Supreme Court, and explains the tricks of crafty zamindars and dishonest lawyers to create difficulties for the Company's servants, particularly for those who worked in connection with the revenues. He quotes Impey's complacent statement that "the Supreme Court is felt as well as professed to be a blessing to the innocent inhabitants of this Settlement and country," and then observes: "There can be little doubt that the people in general, particularly of the country-side, dreaded nothing more than the processes of the Supreme Court and its officers." Against Sir James Stephen, the valiant champion of the Court, he quotes James Mill: "The motive (of the Court)...cannot be mistaken .... It was the appetite for power, and the appetite for profit...." Professor Banerjee "leaves it to the reader to judge, which of the two views, Mill's or Stephen's, is more in accordance with the facts and the probabilities of the case." The reader is likely to prefer the historian's verdict to the lawyer's advocacy.

A detailed study of "The Supreme Court and the Nizamat" follows in Chapter III. Professor Banerjee shows how the Nawab's functions and powers were subjected to a process of erosion by the treaties concluded with Mir Jafar and his successors and quotes the well-known words of Clive's last Minute: "We are sensible that since the acquisition of the Dewanny the power formerly belonging to the Soubah of these provinces is totally in fact vested in the East India Company. Nothing remains to him but the name and shadow of authority. This name, however, this shadow, it is indispensably necessary we would seem to venerate." The administrative changes introduced by Warren Hastings virtually meant the transfer of the *Nizamat* to the Company. In Rai Radhacharan's case the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court observed: "...he (the Nawab) performs no act of sovereignty independent of, and without the consent of, the representatives of the East India Company. Nothing is left to Mubarick but an empty title." Justice Le Maistre referred to the Nawab as a "phantom" and as a "man of straw". This was the position of the Nawab in 1775; in less than twenty years from Plassey he had ceased to be regarded as the possessor of even formal sovereignty.

This view, however, did not commend itself to the Majority in the Council. They argued that it was not really necessary for the Supreme Court in Rai Radhacharan's case to decide on the Nawab's sovereignty; in this they were fortified by the opinion of Justice Chambers of the Supreme Court. They were anxious, "for reasons of the most serious and political importance,...to support the authority of the Country Government, and the Sovereignty of the Saubah." In effect, the Majority repeated Clive's argument that the Company should avoid all appearance of dominion in Bengal so that the jealousy of the country Powers and of other European trading nations might not be roused. Thus the Court's legalistic attitude came in conflict with the Company's political interest. Here Professor Banerjee supports the Court; the Judges, he says, "acted perfectly within their rights and...the Majority itself adopted a meddlesome and obstructive attitude." The Majority fought really for a shadow. "The policy of holding up the Nawab as the ostensible Sovereign could no longer deceive anybody...." As Warren Hastings wrote, "All the arts of policy cannot conceal the power by which these provinces are ruled, nor can all the arts of sophistry avail to transfer the responsibility of them to the Nawab, when it is visible as the light of the sun that they originate from our own Government, that the Nawab is a mere pageant without so much as the shadow of authority." In spite of this Professor Banerjee rejects Sir James Stephen's unqualified condemnation of the Council and quotes with apparent approval Beveridge's comment that Sir James Stephen often looks at questions from the point of view of a mere practising lawyer.

The two concluding chapters deal with the Dacca Case and the Kasijora Case. In the former case "dreadful consequences" of "a direct collision between the Supreme Court and the Nizamat," on the question of the Court's jurisdiction over the officers of the Nizamat, were prevented by "the tact and moderation displayed by the Dacca Council." Without discussing the intricacies of the legal issues involved in the dispute Professor Banerjee remarks that "as a matter of expediency, the Court should have proceeded with due caution and deliberation." The responsibility for the maintenance of law and order was vested in the Executive; without due regard for this fact "the Judges sat tight on their dignity and threw obstacles after obstacles on the path of the Government." The conflict reached its climax in the Kasijora Case which (to quote Sir James Stephen) presented "the discreditable spectacle of a governing Council marching troops against the officers of the Supreme Court." Professor Banerjee criticises Sir James Stephen for his "strict adherence to the legal merits of the dispute" which are, in his view, "of secondary importance in any judgement on the Kasijora Case." He refers to the Council's open avowal that their actions might not be legally correct and supports their contention that these were justified by the circumstances and the necessities of the situation. He reminds the reader that the war with the Marathas was in progress, that the war with

Haidar Ali was about to begin, and that "the whole resources of Britain were strained to the utmost by the struggle with the American colonists, France, Spain and Holland." The judges (as the Governor-General and Council complained) were not "solicitous to adapt the practice to the place." The difficulties of the Executive—internal and external—justified, in Professor Banerjee's view, the extreme step of forcibly resisting the Court's processes on the Zamindars. But he admits that there is scope for "honest differences" on such an issue; he feels he has done his best by putting the reader "in possession of all the essential facts and view-points to be able to form his own conclusions."

In writing about the Supreme Court Professor Banerjee stands firmly on ground entirely different from that covered in his *Evolution of the Khalsa*. There is nothing religious or philosophical about the conflict between the Judiciary and the Executive; there are, on the other hand, legal and administrative issues of real complexity requiring clarification in the light of the political complications faced by the infant British power in Bengal. The sources of information are elaborate official documents, precise and objective, entirely unlike the floating legends relating to the Sikh Gurus. It is a high tribute to Professor Banerjee's capacity as a historian—to the sweep and depth of his knowledge and judgement—to say that he performed his task in two entirely different sectors of history with almost equal credit.

In conclusion, it is necessary to refer to Professor Banerjee's Presidential Address at the Annamalainagar Session of the Indian History Congress (Modern Section) for some of his general ideas on History. He does not agree with those who say that "a historian must not have a point of view but should walk faithfully and patiently on the way that his materials might lead him to; or that, in other words, he should adhere strictly to what is called the calm objective method." In his view "the objective method should be relentlessly pursued till at last a point of view emerges and then the materials should be selected and sifted from this new angle and presented in a systematic and consistent form." Mere accumulation of facts would not satisfy him; for him "discernment in the selection of significant facts" is more important, and this, he thinks, is not possible for a historian who has no point of view. His remarks relate particularly to the modern period of Indian history "where the rich crop of new facts of varied texture, revealed by the study of the records, often makes it difficult for the historian to resist the temptation of presenting as many of them as possible before his reader." He does not think "it is worth a historian's trouble to write a book based on research in which no new note is struck, no thought is provoked," and the reader is merely put in "passing contact with a mass of hitherto unrevealed facts which are mostly forgotten as soon as they are read." It is an exacting standard which Professor Banerjee sets up for historical writing.

Apart from objectivity as defined above, Professor Banerjee insists upon "the genetic conception of History." He says, "History is a continuous process, and however narrow and restricted the immediate field of a historian might be, it will not do for him to forget that his theme is a part of a bigger whole and logically connected with themes or events of a wider import. This contact with a broader context in the mental background of the historian gives him a true perspective and his presentation is enlivened because he is saved from constantly missing the wood for the trees." He is aware that such "contact with a broader context" may not be possible, and may even be misleading, in the present stage of Indian historical studies. In that case, he says, "we should be modest with regard to our own achievements and realise the unpleasant truth that we are not historians in the proper sense of the term at all, but mere collectors of materials for the future historians."

Finally, Professor Banerjee issues a note of warning which has particular relevance to historical writing on modern India. Speaking in 1945 when freedom was not in sight he realised that it was "no easy matter to divorce the study of the past from the angry passions of the present." Some European writers on Indo-British history, he said, "appear as pitiful apologists for British rule in India, and we, on the other hand, have not unoften gone to the other extreme." In those days "angry passions" were sweeping over the country; yet Professor Banerjee warned his fellow craftsmen that "a historian, especially of our period, should be constantly on his guard lest he forgets that his vocation is to worship only at the shrine of truth and that he should allow no temptation to deflect him from the straight and honourable path that is his." The lapse of time has mollified our "angry passions" and we are now in a better position to make an assessment of British rule in India as honest votaries at the shrine of truth.

KAVIRAJ SHYAMALDAS

DR. G. N. SHARMA

(University of Rajasthan, Jaipur)

SHYAMALDAS, better known as Kaviraj, was one of the most important historians of modern Rajasthan. It is a matter of great relief that we get some glimpses of the biographical account of this famous historian, and some few particulars of his family from his own pen.[1] His ancestors, as he informs us, belonged to that sect of Charans who were the 'pol-pat' or Lord of the Gate of the Sankhala Parmars of the Ran of Cutch. They, by virtue of being the Sasan holders of the village Dadhivada, were called Dadhivadiya Charans. When Ranmal and Jodha, in the mid-fifteenth century, occupied the region of Ran, the Sankhala Parmars together with the Dadhivadiya family migrated to Mewar. There Maharana Kumbha, who discerned in Jait Singh, the leader of Dadhivadia family, the attributes of learning, treated him kindly and conferred upon him two villages of Dharta and Gopita for his maintenance. In course of time, the family rose to eminence and its importance was duly recognised by the Ranas by way of further addition of the Sasan villages of Dhokaliya, Shavar, Nayagaon, Jaitsinghpura and Jhatra. Out of these villages Dhonkaliya remained the home of the main sect of the Dadhivadia Charan family.

In this family, Shyamaldas, one of the four sons of Qaim Shah, was born on the 7th of the dark-half of Ashadha, v.s. 1893, 5 July 1836. He passed his infancy in his paternal village, where he received his education under his father's care. Nature had endowed him with a marvellous memory, a keen and penetrating intellect, and an enormous capacity for assimilating knowledge of all kinds. At the tender age of nine he started with *Saraswat* and *Amar Kosh*, and continued to concentrate on the study of *Kavya*, Logic, Mathematics, Astrology, Astronomy,[2] Tantra, Epics and the Science of Medicine. He had also acquired a proficiency in the Dingal poetry, which he made use of in his writings. He cherished a great love for history from his childhood, and pursued with indefatigable ardour the study of the Epics, the Puranas and the Persian chronicles which treated of that science. With this kind of study he developed a taste for and mastery over the knowledge of historical literature. This extensive range of reading and studying evidently displays Kaviraj, in his youth, as a man of scholarship, genius and observation.

By his father Shyamaldas was introduced into the Court of Maharana Shambhu Singh in his eleventh year. There his abilities were soon realized, and he was entrusted with the task of compiling a comprehensive history

of Mewar in collaboration with Purohit Padmanath in 1871. The writer, in obedience to the orders of Shambhu Singh, undertook the work of collecting source material of a varied nature. But the task of collecting material was interrupted by the death of Shambhu Singh in 1874, and hence the performance of the work was for a time suspended.

The new Maharana Sajjan Singh, who was a great patron of learning and a man of liberal ideas, was immensely impressed with Shyamaldas's abilities and scholarship. He laid unbounded confidence in the young courtier. He made him his chief adviser[3] in matters of survey and assessment of revenue, establishment of courts and the council of 'Mahadrajsabha' and improvement of the town of Udaipur with buildings, lanes and roads. He was also required by the Maharana to act as his chief counsellor regarding the recommendation of the bestowal of gifts and honours on men of learning and eminence. During the course of his discharging the duties as a civilian he also distinguished himself as a soldier. In the year 1881 A.D., when the Maharana resolved on repelling the Bhils of the Magra district, he joined the party which suppressed the rising and conveyed impartial intelligence to the Maharana so that proper steps might be taken to meet the situation.[4]

Even if Kaviraj had not distinguished himself as a great administrator, his memory would have always been revered as a great historian. It was Col. Impey, the then Political Agent in Udaipur, who urged upon the Maharana to utilize the services of Shyamaldas in undertaking the much -needed work of compiling a history of Mewar and organizing historical research on modern lines. Having collected a valuable library of the most esteemed works, published and unpublished, the Maharana, therefore, placed Shyamaldas in charge of it in 1875, and ordered him to continue his earlier work of compiling a detailed history of Mewar. Had it not been for Sajjan Singh's considerable kindness in placing him in charge of the library, he could not have completed the work of such a dimension in fifteen years of time.

In order to expedite the execution of the work a huge sum of one lakh of rupees was placed at his disposal. A department entitled 'Itihaskaryalaya' was established, and a team of competent scholars in Sanskrit, English, Arabic and Persian was appointed to assist him in the work of compiling the history. Gobind Gangadhar Pandey, a renowned scholar of Sanskrit, helped Kaviraj in collecting inscriptions and deciphering them for the work. Similarly, Maulvi Abdul Gani Khan and Maulvi Abaidulla Farhati were at his disposal to read out and interpret Persian and Arabic works for the proposed history. Babu Ramprasad's talent was used in reading out extracts from the histories in English language. Dashora Durlabh Ram was the head-scribe to copy out relevant extracts from historical literature in Sanskrit and Rajasthani. Dr. Ojha, who later on became the worthy successor of Kaviraj, was appointed as a Munshi—Secretary of the

'Karyalaya'. Thus the task of compiling a history of Mewar, entitled *Vir Vinod*, commenced with great effort and enthusiasm.[5]

The Maharana being impressed with his deep and critical scholarship honoured him by conferring upon him the high-sounding title of 'Kaviraj' in 1879. His writings and fame brought him in the front rank of the distinguished scholars and earned for him the membership of the Royal Asiatic Society. He was also awarded the title of 'Mahamahopadhyaya' in January 1888.[6]

In bringing out the voluminous work Kaviraj took fifteen years. Unfortunately his late patron Sajjan Singh, due to his premature death in 1884, could not see to its publication, the printing of which was completed only in the reign of Maharana Fateh Singh in 1886.

Kaviraj seems not to have been quite happy in his later life, either due to his being misunderstood by the Darbar, or becoming quite an uninfluential courtier in his old age. The unsettled nature of his later life is shown by the abrupt end of his work at the death of Sajjan Singh, a work which he could have carried further if he could have secured the esteem of Maharana Fateh Singh. He died in 1893. Soon after his death his monumental work had also to face the ordeal of being sealed for about half a century by the order of the Maharana. It was the charitable disposition of Maharana Bhupal Singh, the son and successor of Maharana Fateh Singh, which rescued the worthy memory of Kaviraj from oblivion in or about 1945.[7]

As regards the contents of the *Vir Vinod* it may be observed that this comprehensive work contains much information in Hindi on the history of Mewar to which it relates. Along with the narration of the events of Mewar history the author has also provided a brief account of other states of Rajputana together with the history of the Sultans of various provinces, the Mughal Emperors and the British ascendancy as his plan demanded.

The following is a careful analysis of the contents of the *Vir Vinod*. It is available in print in five thick volumes, though its divisions suggest that it was originally intended to be divided into two parts—with *prakarans* or chapters devoted to the different rulers and the States.

The first volume contains a geographical description of Europe, Africa, America, some Asiatic countries and India.[8] In giving the details of the history of India he has included events from the earliest times to the Viceroyalty of Lansdowne.[9] Then he takes up the geographical account of Rajputana and Mewar, including therein the description of the people, their customs, festivals, coins, weights, judicial organisation, etc.[10] The author then dwells at length on the genealogical description of the early Guhilots and comes down to the time of Rana Sanga.[11] For the profit of the readers he also provides the original texts of a large number of inscriptions.[12]

The second volume includes the history of the rulers of Mewar from Ratan Singh to Amar Singh I's time.[13] In proper context a brief history of the Mughal Emperors,[14] the Sultans of Mandu[15] and Gujarat,[16] the rulers of Bhavanagar,[17] Patiala,[18] Bundi,[19] etc. has also been traced. In this volume the text as well as the Hindi rendering of the important *Farmans* and *Nishans,* etc. have been provided along with some inscriptions.[20]

The third volume commences from Karan Singh's reign.[21] In between there is the history of the Mughals,[22] Bikaner,[23] Kishangarh,[24] Riva,[25] etc. In appendices the full text of the *Rajprashasti Mahakavya,* other inscriptions of note and the *Farmans* of the period of Shahjahan and Aurangzib have been provided.[26]

The fourth volume begins with Amar Singh II and ends with Jagat Singh II.[27] In between these chapters the history of Jodhpur,[28] Rampura,[29] Idar,[29a] Banswara,[30] Dungarpur,[31] Pratapgarh,[32] Sirohi,[33] Jaipur,[34] Alwar,[35] Kota,[36] Karauli,[37] and the Marathas[38] along with the texts of relevant inscriptions and letters[39] has been given.

The fifth volume deals with the history of Jawan Singh to Sajjan Singh's time.[39a] In this volume the author tries to refer to some of the important courtiers of his own time.[40] He also gives the Hindi rendering of the Engagements and Treaties and several letters of the British Officers.[41]

In all the entire work comprises 2684 full-size pages in bold printing.

The *Vir Vinod* is thus the production of a learned and accomplished man, and the latter part, especially from Sambhu Singh to Sajjan Singh, of a contemporary writer acquainted with the men and events he describes. From 1847 to 1886 Kaviraj personally saw much, and he observed and recorded what passed under his own eyes, or what he learnt by diligent inquiry. Moreover, the author appears to have availed himself of all the best sources of information open to him, for his collection reveals that there is no historical work, Sanskrit or Persian, of any celebrity which he does not use. This kind of work required of the author much care in ascertaining facts and collecting material from various parts of Rajputana and India, and as several other persons of note afforded their assistance in the compilation, it is entitled to much credit.

The introductory part of the first volume and other parts dealing with dynastic histories and history of the political events of Rajputana States abound in statistical details. They contain exact accounts of the boundaries, population, resources, flora, fauna and other details of the natural history of Rajputana in general and of Mewar in particular.

It is not only in the narration of political and statistical details that the work excels, it presents also what is so exceedingly rare in Rajputana history, the character of his own countrymen and contemporaries—their manners, dress, taste, habits—and with such minuteness that they form part of our acquaintance.[42] He notices with care and understanding several festivals, such as Gangor, Holi, Navratri, Dashera, Dipavali, Tikador and

Ahiria[43] and the life of the Bhils, Vaishyas, Rajputs, Gadariya Lohar' Meena, Kanjar, Sansi,[44] etc.

While writing history, our author makes mention of the ideals[45] of writing history which, according to him, should be straight and free from prejudice or praise. In his preface, after pointing out the merits and uses of history, he observes that it should be free from exaggeration after the Puranic style. To the credit of Kaviraj it may be mentioned that the accounts of his patrons—Shambhu Singh[46] and Sajjan Singh[47]—bear all the appearance of truth and honesty, and are to a great degree exempt from that exaggeration and fulsome eulogy to which the Khyata writers are generally inclined. When he praises all the good qualities of these princes and the benevolent measures adopted for the improvement of the State by them, he does not hesitate to condemn their weaknesses and the licentious habits in which they indulged.[48]

As regards the style and method adopted by Kaviraj in writing the *Vir Vinod*, it may be said that it is a fine blending of the methods of narration adopted by his predecessors—Persian chroniclers, 'Khyata' writers and Col. Tod. Like Nensi, the writer of *Muhanet Nensi Khyata*, his history of Mewar contains accounts of various Rajput States and precedes with a description of physical geography in each case. Like Dayaldas, the writer of the *Dayaldas Khyata*, Kaviraj includes in his history the texts of original inscriptions, *pattas*, letters and other relevant documents. The references to various persons, customs and usages of the time are after the style of the *Bankidas Vata* which never likes to keep its reader in dark about the events and persons known to its writer. Like Suryamal Misran, the celebrated writer of the *Vamshabhaskar*, our author also uses odes[49] at the end of a chapter, though sparingly, in praise of important princes. Like the Persian chroniclers Kaviraj has skilfully woven into his narrative a resume of the history of the world and the history of the heavenly bodies. Similarly, Shyamaldas as an old servant of the Sisodia rulers, who gave him orders to write a history of their dynasty, did the same for them as Minhaj and Barni had done for the kings of their times. Like the chronicle writers in Persian our author uses dignified terms for his patron and shows all reverence for them. From these works he borrows a large number of Persian words and phrases.[50] But, basically as he was brought up in the atmosphere of bardic lore and legendary tales, he did not fail to introduce events of martial action, noble sacrifices and fierce passions with effect.[51]

As the imprints of the traditional historians are patent in the *Vir Vinod* so are the impressions of Col. Tod's *Annals and Antiquities* glaring. The incorporation of institutional description in the *Vinod* is largely inspired by Col. Tod's plan, for our author like Tod tries to make a scientific analysis of the Jagir system[52] and other institutions.[53] The entire system of scientific inquiry utilized by Kaviraj is mainly stimulated by Tod's inquisitive urge for investigation and research.

The great merit of the *Vir Vinod* lies in the fact that it is especially useful as a correcting agency of the errors committed by Col. Tod. Acknowledging the usefulness of Tod's work, our author endeavours to correct the mistakes occurring therein. A few examples may be quoted to substantiate the statement. Kaviraj disagrees with Col. Tod in accepting Shiladitya as the father of Guhil and bases his conclusion on a careful analysis of the Vallabhi Copperplate grant of Vallabhi *Samvat* 447, the Kunda Inscription of 661, and the Atpur Ins. of 1010.[54] He further points out that Tod is not correct to identify Bapa with Shila, the father of Aparajit. But, in fact, Aparajit was the son of Shila according to the Kundagram Ins. of v.s. 770, and as such Mahendra and Bapa may be taken as identical names. Again on the basis of the *Eklingamahatmya* he is inclined to believe that Bapa ruled for nineteen years and not for twenty-six as Tod thinks.[55] Of course, the dates fixed by Kaviraj regarding these early rulers are tentative; they have been certainly calculated on sounder grounds. With regard to the date of v.s. 1158 for the battle of Tarain given in the *Prithviraj Raso* Tod is silent. But Kaviraj has offered a scholarly discussion on the work with care and understanding, and has reached the conclusion that Samar Singh of Mewar was not a contemporary of Prithviraj.[56] Similarly, Kaviraj rejects the assertion of Col. Tod, on the basis of sound arguments, that Mira was the wife of Maharana Kumbha, and that Salim was present at the battle of Haldighat.[57] According to Kaviraj, Tod is mistaken to take Hardas Rathor as the father of Maldev. In fact, he was his grandfather.[57a] He has also pointed out that Tod has made a confusion in regarding Humayun and Kshetra Singh, and Lallakhan as contemporaries.[58] Hansa Bai, the sister of Ranmal, has been called the daughter of Ranmal by Tod by mistake. Kaviraj has corrected this error.[59]

As Kaviraj was inspired by Col. Tod in scientific investigation and study of historical literature, so he was also impressed by the teachings of Dayanand Saraswati in the study of Vedic literature. He mentions without reserve that formerly he had a faith in superstitions, demons and several other Tantrik beliefs. But after a deep study of the Vedic literature he came to the conclusion that all such beliefs were vain. According to him, if there is anything worth believing, it is the Vedic religion. This kind of free thinking and liberal attitude, reflected in the work of Kaviraj, is largely influenced by the liberal thinking of the Swami.[60]

Thus, the *Vir Vinod* is one of the most celebrated histories in Hindi prose, compiled upon new lines, in which Mewar and other Rajputana States form the subject matter of our study. Due to its merits the work has been recognised by contemporary historians as a standard work. From this work Dr. Ojha, Pandit Reu and others have copiously extracted, and it forms the basis of their histories. Subsequent writers like Dr. Tripathi, Dr. Qanungo, Dr. D. R. Sharma, Dr. M. L. Sharma, the humble writer and others also have held it in the highest estimation, and have quoted

from it. But, to our surprise, Dr. Ojha, in drawing the genealogical table of the early Guhilots, determining the date of the conquest of Chitor by Bapa and his death at Nagda, has made no mention of the *Vir Vinod*, though these facts have been borrowed freely from that work.[61] These are not the only instances of this kind of adoption of facts verbatim from the *Vir Vinod* by Ojha, many more of them can be cited.[62] Of course, this explains to some extent the ban on the circulation of the *Vir Vinod* when M. M. Gaurishanker Ojha was the worthy successor of Shyamaldasji in the field of research.

Unfortunately Kaviraj himself has not properly acknowledged his indebtedness to the earlier *Khyata* writers. He says nothing about Nensi, Dayaldas and Bankidas from whom he has drawn so much. Only at places he uses the term '*Purani Pothi*', perhaps for 'Khyats', without specifying the names of the three pioneer 'Khyata' writers of Rajasthan. Only at one or two places he has made a passing reference to Nensi[63] and *Vamshabhaskar*, the work of highest celebrity. In suppressing the names of these 'Khyata' writers he was labouring, perhaps, under a misapprehension of his being underestimated by the posterity. If he would have cared to cite the works with liberality and charity, our information about many of the 'Khyats' and sources utilized by him would have been richer. But it is singularly strange that for trivial details that he has borrowed from the European writers who were either his contemporaries or near-contemporaries he records with enthusiasm and a sense of obligation their names. They are Cunningham, Aitchison, Hunter, Mill, Elliot, Fleet, Thomas, Taylor and others.

Kaviraj is also particularly disappointing in tracing the origin and depicting the character and achievements of the Charans in highflown language[64] and presenting the sketch of the Brahmans in the darkest hue.[65] It is nothing but the manifestation of a childish desire to enhance the position of his own community and to undermine the ability of the learned class which was definitely superior to it. In his narrow communal outlook he forgets to see that there were master thinkers, astrologers, and literary luminaries in the court of Sambhu Singh and Sajjan Singh among his Brahman contemporaries.[66] One interesting explanation that can be rightly given regarding his extolling of the work of the Charans is that in his age the demand of *neg* by the *Pat-pals* as their special privilege was challenged by the British authority, and it was bringing a bad name to them in the court of the princes. This claim was under the process of being examined. Kaviraj under the guise of writing history must have been deliberately trying to shield the men of his own community. This kind of attempt on the part of Kaviraj was against the fundamental principle of research, correctness, probability or truthfulness.

Another defect of Kaviraj's work arises from its plan. He indulges in dynastic histories which sadly interrupt the unity of the narrative in the

history of Mewar, and often render it a difficult task to restore the broken links of connected history. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that these digressions are the most interesting portions of his work for those who are curious for a comparative study of Rajputana. It seems that his own extensive knowledge of history also induces him very often to presume that his readers should be benefited by what he himself is so intimately acquainted with.

In spite of these few shortcomings Kaviraj deserves to be held in very high esteem both in India and abroad. His other work on the date of Akbar's birth and a few articles published in the Royal Asiatic Society Journal and *Kherkhva-i-Alam* are deemed as excellent contributions of high authority. It is no exaggeration to say that the *Vir Vinod* is a precious work of the highest celebrity on which the legitimate fame of Kaviraj rests.

REFERENCES

1. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, pp. 180-84.
2. The most important works in Astrology and Astronomy which he studied were: *Muhurtachintamani, Muhurtamartanda, Jatakabharan, Muhurtamuktavali, Chamatkarchintamani, Laghuparashari*, etc.
3. *Ruqqa*, v.s. 1933.
4. *Khasa Ruqqa* and Arzi; *Vir Vinod*, vol. V, pp. 2217-29; F. and P. A. April, 1831, nos. 137-79, NAI.
5. *Rajputana-ka-Itihas*, vol. I, pp. 27-28, f. n. 2.
6. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, p. 184.
7. *Panara-ri-Ovri Kagajat*, 1900-41.
8. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, pp. 1-31.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 31-98.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 98-218.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 219-372.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 373-426; The most important of them are: The *Vallabhi Copper-plate* of 447; The *Kunda Village Inscriptions;* The Hindi rendering of *Mori Inscription of* v.s. 770; The *Sandeswar Inscription;* The *Harsidhi Ins.;* The *Nath Ins.;* The *Atpur Ins.;* The *Bijoliyan Ins.* of v.s. 1226; The *Chirva Ins.* of v.s. 1330; The *Rasiyakichhatri Ins.*, v.s. 1331; The *Abu Achaleshwara Ins.*, v.s. 1342; The *Samidheshwara Ins.*, v.s. 1485; The *Mamadeva Ins.*, 1517; The *Dakshindwara Prashasti*, 1545; The *Adinath Ins.*, v.s. 1557, etc.
13. *Vir Vinod*, vol. II, pp. 1-268.
14. *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 15-23, 126-35, 165-214.
15. *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 8-15.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-54.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 91-94.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 100-26.
20. *Ibid.*, *Jala Ins.*, v.s. 1589; *Jawar Ins.*; *Vanbir Ins.*, v.s. 1593; Jahangir's *Farmans*, H. 1024, H. 1025, H. 1027; *Mandal Ins.* of Jagannath.
21. *Vir Vinod*, vol. III, pp. 269-683.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 291-311, 328-80, 683-727.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 477-520.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 520-51.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 551-77.
26. *Chitor Rampol Ins.*, v.s. 1678; *Badipol Ins.*, *Shahajahan's Mansabdar's list*, pp. 362-80 *Bedwas Ins.*, v.s. 1725; *Jagannath Rai Ins.*, v.s. 1708; *Rajprashasti Ins.*
27. *Vir Vinod*, vol. IV, pp. 729-1245.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 790-95.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 991-1000.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 1025-47.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 1000-03.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 1048-75.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 1076-1129.
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 1246-1354.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 1355-1404.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 1405-52.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 1487-97.
38. *Ibid.*, pp. 1581-1625.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 1518-34.

39a. *Vir Vinod*, vol. V, pp. 1785-2257.

40. They were Mehta Gopaldas, Kothari Kesri Singh, Mehta Gokulchand, Lakshman Rao, Pancholi Prannath, Akshaynath, Dhayabhai Ajitsingh, Rai Pannalal and others.
41. *Kharita*, William Bentinck, *Ikrarnama*, Sher Singh, v.s. 1887 *Kharita*, Sutherland *Kharita*, Col. Robertson; *Kharita*, Henry Lawrence; etc.
42. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, pp. 101-20.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 120-36.
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 189-240; vol. II, pp. 126-43; vol. V, pp. 2217-29.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 182-84.
46. *Ibid.*, vol. V., pp. 2057-2138.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 2139-2259.
48. *Ibid.*, pp. 2124-25, 2255.
49. *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 214 (Pratap), p. 268 (Amarsingh), III, p. 313 (Karansingh), p. 400 (Jagatsingh), pp. 642-43 (Rajsingh), p. 728 (Jaisingh), IV, pp. 953-54 (Amarsingh II), pp. 1215-16 (Sangramsingh II), pp. 1533-34 (Jagatsingh II), pp. 1688-89 (Arisingh III), pp. 1783-84 (Bhimsingh), V, p. 1888 (Jawansingh), p. 1907 (Sardarsingh), p. 2059 (Swaroopsingh), p. 2138 (Sambhusingh).
50. Some of these words are: *Muamalah, Fenslah, Khayal; Jamiyat, Shukriyah, Barkhilaf*, etc.
51. Raghavdev's murder, *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, p. 319; Charniyadevi episode, pp. 343-44, etc.
52. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, pp. 136-42; His discussions of *Bhom, Jagir, Bantiya, Chokidari* and *Sasan* are instructive.
53. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, pp. 213-18; The details of various departments as *Kapade-ka-Bhandar, Rasoda, Pande-ki-Ovri, Sayar, Pherashkhana, Chhapalikhana, Jangiphoj, Mahadraj Sabha*, etc.
54. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, pp. 248-50.
55. *Ibid.*, pp. 250-52; compare Tod, I, pp. 259-69.
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 252-267; compare Tod, I, pp. 398-401.
57. *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 371; vol. II, p. 154; compare Tod, I, pp. 392-93.

57a. *Ibid.*, p. 297.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 302.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 308.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 180-82; Ojha, *Udaipur Rajya-ka-Itihas*, vol. II, pp. 836-37.
61. Compare Ojha, *Udaipur Rajya-ka-Itihas*, vol. I, pp. 96-118 and *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, pp. 248-54.
62. The denial of the fact of Salim's presence at Haldighat has been taken from the *Vir Vinod* by Dr. Ojha. Compare Ojha's *History of Udaipur*, vol. I, p. 429 (f.n. no. 3) and *Vir Vinod*, vol. II, p. 154. Similarly, that Samarsingh was not the contemporary of Prithviraj has been pointed out by Kaviraj; compare Ojha, vol. I, p. 153- and *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, p. 267.
63. *Vir Vinod*, vol. I, p. 323.
64. *Ibid.*, pp. 168-80.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
66. Subhramanya Shastri, Vinayaka Shastri, Narayandev, Ajitdev, Vaidya Narain Bhatt, Bhattmeswara Kashidatt, Purohit Sawai Lal, Pandit Vrijanath, Jyoti Mukat Ram and others were learned Brahmins of his time.

GAURISHANKER HIRACHAND OJHA

DR. M. S. JAIN

(University of Rajasthan, Jaipur)

GAURISHANKER OJHA was born in 1863 A.D. (1920 v.s.) at Rohera in the former Sirohi state of Rajputana in a poor family. He studied in the village for some time and at the age of fourteen went to Bombay where he passed his Matriculation examination in 1885. He was admitted to Wilson College but could not pass his Intermediate examination as he fell ill. He also tried to study law but could not carry on. He started studying at the Asiatic Society's Library, Bombay, and made both ends meet by giving private tuition. Here he was inspired by Dr. Bhagwan Lal Indra to study ancient scripts and was taught the principles of studying coins. He was attracted to the study of Rajput history by Forbes, author of the *Rasamala*, who also had a number of documents and prints of Abu inscriptions with him. Later on he was inspired by Tod's *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*.

On 1st Chaitra, 1944 v.s. (1887 A.D.), he reached Udaipur and got a job as Assistant Secretary, Itihas Vibhag, Udaipur, because Mahamahopadhyaya Kaviraj Syamaldas took a fancy to the young boy who supported him in his view that the *Prithviraj Raso* was not written in the 12th century A.D. but was a recent work. In 1890 A.D. when the Victoria Hall Museum was opened in Udaipur, Ojha was appointed its Curator. In November, 1902, Ojha was entrusted with the task of showing to Lord Curzon the various historical sites of Udaipur state Curzon was pleased with Ojha and invited him to the Delhi Durbar in 1903.

In 1908 Lord Minto appointed him as Curator, Rajputana Museum, Ajmer. In 1914 he was awarded the title of Rai Bahadur and in 1928 he was given the title of Mahamahopadhyaya. In 1920, when he accepted the honorary editorship of the *Nagri Pracharini Patrika*, he gave it the form of a research magazine. He edited it for thirteen years. In 1924 he was awarded the Mangala Prasad Prize by the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan at Delhi. In 1927 he was elected President of Bharatpur session of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan and in 1928 he presided over the historical section of the Gujarat Sahitya Parishad held at Nadiad. In 1928 he was invited to deliver three lectures on Medieval Indian Culture (600-1200 A.D.) under the auspices of Hindusthan Academy, U.P., Allahabad, and the same were published in the form of a book later on.

Till 1938 he worked at the Rajputana Museum at Ajmer. In 1933 he was presented the *Bharatiya Anusheelan* by the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan. In 1937 he was given the title of 'Sahitya Vachaspati', and the same year

he was also conferred D.Litt. (*Honoris Causa*) by the Benares Hindu University. The Andhra University also conferred on him the title of 'Puratattva Vetta'. He died on April 17, 1947.

Gaurishanker Ojha's first work was the *Pracheen Lipimala*, published in 1894, when he worked as Curator of the Victoria Hall Museum, Udaipur. It was the first book of its kind in any Indian language and was very much appreciated by European and Indian scholars. It traced the chronological and systematic development of ancient Indian scripts. The book even inspired Dr. Buhler of Germany to publish his *Indische Paleography* two years later. The book gave an impetus to the study of the subject and facilitated the study of Paleography. The book, being in Hindi, enabled Indian scholars to remove their ignorance of ancient Indian scripts on stone, copperplates and coins. As a result, the Indian universities included Paleography as an optional subject for the M.A. degree; the Calcutta University prescribed the book for the M.A. examination. He had worked hard and collected the material from the *Indian Antiquary*, the *Epigraphia Indica* and the *South Indian Inscriptions*. It was very much in demand and Ojha brought out a second edition twenty-four years later in 1918. The second edition was far more voluminous than the first.

Shortly after 1894, he wrote a brief biography of James Tod. In 1902 he translated and edited Col. James Tod's *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* in Hindi. Only fourteen parts of this work could be edited by him, which were published from Patna. In 1908 he wrote the *History of the Solankis* and started contributing articles to the *Nagri Pracharini Patrika*. He also wrote a small pamphlet on *Bharatvarsh ke itihas ki pracheen samigri* on which the Nagri Pracharini Sabha awarded him a prize. In co-operation with Jodha Singh Mehta, he started the work of collection of historical stories, the first part of which was published as *Rajasthan-itihasik Dant-Katha* under the anonymous authorship of a 'Rajasthan niwasi'.

He started publishing his *Rajputana ka itihas* from 1924 onwards in the following order:

Rajputana ka itihas	vol. I, 1981 v.s. (1924 A.D.)
Udaipur Rajya ka itihas	vol. I, 1985 v.s. (1928 A.D.)
,, ,,	vol. II, 1988 v.s. (1931 A.D.)
Rajputana ka itihas	vol. II, 1988 v.s. (1931 A.D.)
,, ,,	vol. III, pt. I (Dungarpur), 1936 A.D.
,, ,,	vol. III, pt. II (Banswara), 1937 A.D.
,, ,,	vol. III, pt. III (Pratapgarh), 1940 A.D.
,, ,,	vol. IV, pt. I (Jodhpur), 1938 A.D.
,, ,,	vol. IV, pt. II (Jodhpur), 1941 A.D.
,, ,,	vol. V, pt. I (Bikaner), 1939 A.D.
,, ,,	vol. V, pt. II (Bikaner), 1940 A.D.

In his first volume of *Rajputana ka itihas* Ojha criticised the theory of the origin of the Rajputs advanced by Tod and V. A. Smith who had considered them to have descended from the Scythians and the Sakas. He contended that the supporters of the foreign origin of the Rajputs had not been able to advance any definite evidence of a particular Rajput dynasty —Solankis, Chauhans, Rathors, Parmars, etc.—having descended from a particular race—the Sakas, the Scythians or the Kushanas.[1] He put forward the view that the Rajputs were the descendants of the Aryan race and were Kshatriyas from the very beginning. He criticised the view that the four clans of Rajputs—Chauhans, Solankis, Pratihars and Parmars—were 'agnivanshi' because no records propounding this view were available which could be dated before the 16th century.[2]

While discussing the mutual relations of the states of Rajputana, their relations with the Muslims, the Marathas and the English, Ojha considered the main causes of Rajput failure to be their lack of education, their self-centred character, polygamy and addiction to wine.[3] He held the Marathas to be responsible for the destruction of agriculture and business in Rajputana. He even blamed Shivaji for having founded a Hindu kingdom, not on the bedrock of nationalist sentiments but on weak and sandy foundations which easily gave way before mutual rivalry. He found fault with the Marathas for having resorted to plunder, cruelty and injustice as the means of extending their rule.[4]

Among the main contributions made by Ojha in this volume, the following are significant: (i) He differed from Tod who had considered Guhil, the founder of Udaipur state, to have descended from Nausherwan of Persia and considered him to be the son of Shiladitya of Vallabhi. Ojha pronounced him to be a Kshatriya, descended from Kush, the eldest son of Ramchandra. He also differed from D. R. Bhandarkar who had considered Guhil to be a Brahmin.[5] (ii) Tod and others had generally accepted 'Bapa' to be a title adopted by the Mewar rulers. Syamaldas was the first to consider Bapa to be the name of Mahendra, son of Aprajit. Ojha followed Syamaldas, but differed from him inasmuch as he considered Bapa to be the son of Mahendra.[6]

Ojha's book brought to the forefront the importance of local sources as contrasted with the Persian sources in tracing the political history of various parts of India. According to Chirwa inscription, Jaitra Singh repulsed a Muslim invasion of Chittor by Iltutmish in a battle near Nagda.[7] The Abu Inscription of 1285 A.D. clearly mentioned that Samar Singh of Mewar protected Gujarat from the Muslim invaders. The Persian historians do not mention an attack on Gujarat by either Balban or any of his generals simply because the Muslims had lost the battle. On the evidence of Jinprabhu Suri (a contemporary of Samar Singh and Ulugh Khan), who wrote the *Tirth Kalp*, Ojha came to the conclusion that Alauddin's general, Ulugh Khan, was defeated by Samar Singh of Chittor.[8]

This volume was very much appreciated in India and Europe. The famous archaeologist, L. D. Barnett, was of the opinion that it would be a true commemoration to the importance of Rajputana. The Benares Hindu University prescribed the volume in its History syllabi and the Punjab University prescribed it for the 'Hindi Prabhakar' examination. The volume brought to the forefront the value of inscriptions and numismatics as a source of history as also the importance of local records.

Soon after the publication of the first volume of *Rajputana ka itihas*, Ojha seems to have realised that it would be far more logical, profitable and convenient to write the history of Rajputana, dividing it into a history of the various states. This would secure an easy market for his books and would encourage other states to patronise him for writing their histories, once he had completed a history of Udaipur. He was very well-equipped for writing a history of Udaipur where he had lived and worked for over twenty years. Therefore his second volume of *Rajputana ka itihas* did not come out for seven years. He wrote instead two volumes of *Udaipur Rajya ka itihas* and published them in 1928 and 1931 respectively. The second volume of *Rajputana ka itihas* incorporated a few chapters from the first volume and the entire second volume of *Udaipur rajya ka itihas.* In fact the second volume of *Rajputana ka itihas* ran into more than 900 pages.[9]

Ojha justified this diversion in favour of Udaipur by saying that the history of Mewar was the history of freedom fighting. At a time when most of the Rajput and Hindu states in India had surrendered and accepted the suzerainty of the Mughals, Mewar was the only state which continued to wage a ceaseless war against Mughal imperialism. He considered the history of Udaipur to be particularly instructive because it set an example of how a small state could wage a struggle against the strongest of empires. This struggle set an example of selfless sacrifice, unbounded heroism and idealistic love of freedom, and was without a parallel in the history of the world. He also thought that the ruling house of Mewar was entitled to prominence as it was the oldest surviving Kshatriya house in India or elsewhere.[10]

The process of correcting historical details and description of events continued with greater zeal. Over and above what he had done in his first volume of *Rajputana ka itihas*, he corrected the mistake made by Tod in ascribing the date of accession of Hammir to 1300 A.D. Ojha placed his accession in 1325 when he had defeated an army of Muhammad Tughlaq brought by Jaisi, son of Maldeo Sonegra. Hammir destroyed a huge Muslim army though the Persian chroniclers do not mention it. Ojha was the first to point out that the story of Rana Pratap having written a letter to Akbar was false. Besides, he added five useful appendices to this volume. In Appendix I, he corrected the genealogical table of the House of Mewar. In Appendices II and III, he gave a connected dynastic list of the rulers of

Mewar. In Appendix IV, he raised the important question of the 'gotra' of the Kshatriyas. He reached the conclusion that their 'gotra' was not the indicator of their dynasty-founders, but of their 'purohits'; and with the change of 'purohits', their 'gotras' also could be changed. In Appendix V, he traced the origin of the name 'Singh' and reached the conclusion that such epithets were used for the first time by the Satrap rulers, the Solankis of the Deccan, the Parmars of Malwa and the Guhils of Mewar. Later on the use of this name became more common.

In the second volume of his *Udaipur Rajya ka itihas*, Ojha had greater availability of records and was treading on surer grounds, but he became less original. Very often he depended on Syamaldas's *Vir Vinod* and occasionally mentioned Persian histories. Ojha's main burden of thought in this volume was twofold: Firstly, that the Mewar rulers, though the strongest in Rajputana, could not benefit from the downfall of the Mughal empire because they remained away from the Mughal court and could not be aware of the developments there.[11] Jaipur and Jodhpur could advance their frontiers because they were in touch with the developments at the Mughal court. This is a partisan outlook. The rulers of Mewar, by a peculiar coincidence, were weak and incapable during this period, and hence they failed to benefit by the weakness of the Mughal empire.[12]

Secondly, Ojha considered the Marathas to be agents of destruction of the peace and prosperity of Rajasthan and held the view that the plundering and marauding activities of the Marathas sapped the vitality of Mewar. In the first volume of his *Rajputana ka itihas*, he had considered the disunity among the Rajput rulers to be responsible for their inability to defend themselves against the Marathas and had asserted that the Rajput nobility had invited the Marathas to help them solve their internal disputes with the result that the Rajputs fell a prey to them. In the second volume of his *Udaipur rajya ka itihas* Ojha considered the Hurda pact of 1734 to be significant, where the rulers of Jaipur, Jodhpur and Udaipur had agreed to act combinedly against the Marathas. But he felt that the main reason for the failure of the Hurda pact was that the Rajput rulers did not have common ends. They were not prepared to grant precedence to one over the other.[13]

Ojha's attitude towards the Marathas is clear when he compared the struggle against the Marathas with the struggle against the Mughals. He concluded that Mewar fought for 450 years against the Mughals and the Sultanate (from Jaitra Singh to Raj Singh) without any substantial weakening of her condition. But the Marathas destroyed the vitality of Mewar during sixty years to such an extent that had the British not entered into an alliance with Mewar, it would have been annexed by the Marathas.[14] This is, to say the least, unhistorical. The Marathas had ceased to exist as a political power when Mewar had signed the treaty of alliance with the British. Ojha welcomed the alliance of 1818 since it removed the danger of

Marathas permanently and enabled the state to heave a sigh of relief by putting an end to the mutual squabbles of the nobles.

Ojha has, however, been able to correctly locate the root cause of the malaise from which Mewar suffered in the 18th century. The inefficient and weak rulers of Mewar from 1710 onwards led to a weakening of finances, addiction to wine and turbulence of the nobility. The rival factions of Saktawats and Chundawats invited the Marathas for settling their mutual disputes. Another cause was the marriage of Sawai Jai Singh of Jaipur with Chandra Kunwari, daughter of Maharana Amar Singh II of Mewar, in 1708. Jai Singh who had already other queens agreed that the sons born of this marriage would be the heirs to the throne. Ojha very aptly considers this provision to be very harmful for the future of Rajputana because this led to war between the two dynasties of Jaipur and Udaipur soon after the death of Jai Singh.[15]

It was after the publication of the history of Udaipur that the various states of Rajputana requested Ojha to write their respective histories. These states placed their own staff and records at the disposal of Ojha and he was paid remuneration for his labour. In fact, there was a bitter domestic feud between Banswara and Dungarpur and both of them approached Ojha to write their histories. The main point of dispute was: Which of the two branches—Dungarpur and Banswara—belonged to the elder line of descendants of Maharawal Udai Singh.

Ojha took in hand the writing of the history of both these states simultaneously. The history of Banswara was completed first, but on account of some differences between the state authorities and Ojha the publication of the work was delayed by three years. The history of Dungarpur was published as *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. III, pt. I, in 1936 while the history of Banswara was published as *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. III, pt. II, in 1937.

The history of Dungarpur, written in a very sketchy manner, bears ample internal evidence of its being a hurried work of compilation of statistical data in a chronological order. Even a small section on social and cultural history was missing. In a volume of 212 pages, 44 pages were devoted to geography and early history. The first twenty-seven rulers covering a reign of 636 years get 96 pages; while the last four rulers covering 120 years during the British period get 54 pages.

His main contribution was that Mahap was not the founder of the Dungarpur dynasty. Mahap had been generally accepted to be the founder by Tod, Syamaldas and Erskine.[16] Ojha considered Maharawal Samant Singh to be the founder. Ojha also corrected Nancy's statement that Samant Singh (Samatsi) gave Mewar to his younger brother out of love. The truth was that the younger brother turned out Samant Singh who went to live at Bagad (Dungarpur and Banswara) and founded a separate kingdom.[17]

Ojha is equally brief as regards the political history of Banswara. In a volume of 235 pages, the history of the dynasty from 1530 to 1818 A.D.

covers only 90 pages while the events from 1818 to 1932 A.D. cover 60 pages. While discussing the claims of the state of Banswara about its being founded by the elder son of Maharawal Udai Singh, Ojha dismisses them in a rather hostile language.[18] He did not hesitate to cast aspersions on the rulers of Banswara for the absence of historical material in the state though he did not cast similar aspersions on the rulers of Dungarpur for the absence of historical material in their state. There he blamed the invaders. He considered the absence of a written history of the state to imply that either the state was not politically important or the rulers did not exhibit their bravery and chivalry outside the state. The rulers of Banswara did not have any inscriptional source-material probably because they themselves had no taste for education and had failed to patronise the scholars. Whatever little bardic tales of bravery and chivalry there were, were not considered to have been popular to any large extent.[19]

Ojha considered the signing of treaties of subordinate alliance by Dungarpur and Banswara with the British to be the outcome of the fear of devastation caused by the Pindaris and the Marathas. He was of the opinion that the British had come forward as protectors against the Maratha menace.[20] Dungarpur and Banswara signed the treaty with the British on 11 December and 25 December, 1818, respectively. By its very nature and circumstance, it is apparent that the Marathas had ceased to be a menace in December, 1818; in fact, they had been wiped out about a year earlier. The 12th clause in both the treaties was almost similar. It provided that the British government would not grant quarter to any of their rebellious and disobedient relations and assured them that they would help the rulers to crush the rebellious nobles. There was no mention of help against the Marathas; in fact, it was clearly mentioned that the tributes paid by these rulers to the Marathas would be paid to the British and if their income increased, the tribute to be paid to the British would also increase by about 40% of the increased income. Ojha's argument that it was against the Marathas does not stand a close examination. The internal condition of Dungarpur, on account of some internal trouble later on, again deteriorated and was as bad as that prevalent prior to 1818.[21] In the case of Banswara also, Ojha had to accept that the chiefs of Banswara had become so rebellious and disobedient that they even dared disobey the British.[22]

In 1940 Ojha wrote the history of Pratapgarh as the third part of the third volume of his *Rajputana ka itihas*. Ojha mentions that the ruler of Pratapgarh sent the entire available historical information to him and even deputed Pandit Jagannath Shastri, head-pandit of Raghunath Sanskrit Pathsala, Pratapgarh, and Shah Mannalal Padliya to help him write the history.[23] In his history of Jodhpur which Ojha planned to publish in three parts, of which only two could be published, Ojha rejected the traditionally accepted view that the Rathors of Jodhpur and the Gaharwals of Kanauj were one and the same. He considered the *Prithviraj Raso* to be responsible

for this misunderstanding because it confused Chandra Deva of Kanauj with Chandra of Badayun. Ojha was of the opinion that the Gaharwals of Kanauj did not come to Marwar. The Gaharwals were Suryavanshi while the Rathors were Chandravanshi and were probably the descendants of Chandra of Badayun. He found Rao Siha, the founder of Marwar, to be a Rathor.[24]

While writing the history of Jodhpur, he had to depend very much on Nainsi's *Khyat*, *Jodhpur ki khyat*, *Dayal Das ki khyat* and *Vir Vinod*.[25] Ojha correctly analysed the causes of Maratha intervention in Marwar and considered Marwar's overlordship of Gujarat and the rivalry between Ram Singh and Bakht Singh during 1748-53 A.D. to be responsible for this intervention.[26] He did not hesitate to speak the truth about Ajit Singh's ungratefulness to Durga Das. Nemesis overtook him when he was murdered at the hands of his son. Ojha could not publish the third part of the history of Jodhpur.

The last volume of *Rajputana ka itihas* was published in two parts in 1939 and 1940. It contained an account of the history of Bikaner, a state founded by Rao Bika, son of Rao Jodha. Ojha is full of praise for the entire dynasty of Bikaner, beginning from Bika down to Maharaja Ganga Singh. In the two volumes of his history of Bikaner, Ojha has adopted the role of a court historian partly because of the favours conferred upon him by Maharaja Ganga Singh and partly because of the influence the Maharaja had with the British. In fact, he devoted more than 120 pages to the reign of Ganga Singh, the largest space he devoted to any ruler of Rajputana.

He realised that the inscriptional sources from Bikaner were almost negligible, and that none except a 'prashashti' in Bikaner fort had so far been found. He defended this absence of inscriptional sources in Bikaner by saying that stone was not available in the state. Regarding the absence of ancient copperplates and coins, he did not make any comments. He depended, therefore, to a large extent on manuscripts available in large numbers in the State Library, Bikaner. He made a particular mention of Sanskrit and Bhasha granths, *Dayal Das ki Khyat*, *Bank Das ki 'Etihasik Baten'*, Munshi Sohan Lal's *Twarikh-i-Bikaner* and Kanahiya's *Bikaner ke rajya ka itihas.*

The Bikaner rulers were commended for their wisdom in seeking the friendship of the Mughal emperor in a much more lavish manner than were the Mewar rulers for their freedom fighting.[27] The Mughal emperors considered it better to have good relations with Bikaner instead of conquering the kingdom; but the Bikaner rulers considered it proper to establish cordial relations with the Mughals.

Besides these monumental works, Ojha had written a large number of articles, some of which were original in conception. These articles were donated by Ojha to Sahitya Sansthan, Rajasthan Vishwa Vidyapeeth,

Udaipur, which published them in three volumes seven years after his death. These volumes contained in all 63 articles, of which 40 pertained to history, 8 to literature, 2 to sculpture, 2 to geography and 11 to miscellaneous subjects. In an article on the period of composition of the *Prithviraj Raso* Ojha followed Syamaldas and was of the opinion that it was composed about 1600 v.s., a view which is not accepted to be correct. Ojha had failed to appreciate that the *Prithviraj Raso* is an epic poem in which history provided only a base. The rest is mere imagination.[28] In a second article Ojha expressed the opinion that there had been an unknown Kshatriya dynasty of Gaur and on this account he contended that Gora Badal was one man, and not two as commonly supposed. This is also a good example of how Ojha's imagination worked.[29] In another article on the Mewar inscriptions and Ami Shah, Ojha solved a problem which had puzzled the historians of Rajasthan. None, including Syamaldas, had succeeded in identifying Ami Shah who is frequently mentioned in accounts of the period 1364-82 A.D. Ojha was able to solve it on the basis of *Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi* by Rizkullah Mushtaqi who had mentioned that Ami Shah was the original name of Dilawar Khan who became governor of Malwa under Firoz Tughlaq.[30]

Ojha considered the request of Rao Jait Singh of Bikaner to Sher Shah for help against Maldeo's attack on Bikaner to be the factor responsible for Sher Shah's invasion of Marwar.[31] Abul Fazl was held to be wrong in considering Jaimal to have died as a result of a gunshot wound inflicted by Akbar. In fact, Jaimal was very brave and died fighting the next day. As a mark of appreciation of his valour and bravery, Akbar got stone statues of Jaimal and Patta constructed.[32] Maharana Pratap had immense wealth with him, and Tod's version that Bhama Shah surrendered his wealth is simply based on hearsay.[33] Ojha did not agree with the commonly accepted date of birth of Shivaji, and considered 17 January, 1630, to be his birthday.[34]

By the sheer weight and volume of what he wrote, Ojha outshines other Indian historians of his time. By his publications he succeeded firstly in removing a deep prejudice, universal among Indian historians at that time, against the value of local records as sources of information in reconstructing history. Before him it had been customary to rely on the Persian chroniclers for a history of the medieval period. A majority of these Persian chronicles had been court histories written at the command of the Sultans and were naturally vitiated by the current prejudices. They have described, generally speaking, the history of the Delhi court, only occasionally making a mention of the distant provinces which had been able to free themselves from the control of the Delhi Sultans. The history of the Hindu states in general, and of Rajputana in particular, has suffered mainly because it had been told only by hostile critics. The utilisation of indigenous sources had been delayed considerably because of a prevalent belief, deliberately

fostered by the Muslims, that the Hindus lacked the art of writing history.

It was only in the closing years of the 19th century that attention was devoted to a study of Rajput and Maratha history based on original and local sources. When Pratap and Shivaji were regarded as the twin examples of resistance to aggressive imperialism, attention came to be devoted to a study of the history of these regions. It was only when Sajjan Singh, a liberal ruler of Mewar, patronised Kaviraj Syamaldas and established an 'itihas karyalay' that some attention was paid to the history of Rajputana under court patronage. By the time Syamaldas had written his *Vir Vinod* and its printing was completed, Sajjan Singh was succeeded by Fateh Singh who prohibited its circulation.

The prejudice against the utilisation of local sources is dying hard and some medieval scholars, even now, are inclined to give greater weight to the Persian court historians. An interesting and instructive example may not be out of place here. Ojha pointed out that the Persian histories are inclined to call the independent Rajput rulers as zamindars while the Rajasthani 'prashastis' and court records call them Maharajas, Maharajadhiraj, Maharana or Maharawal, etc.[35] Some medieval historians, however, still tend to place a greater reliance on the Perisan histories.

Ojha can also claim the credit of writing history in an Indian language at a time when Hindi was valued much less than it is today in the academic world. An unsympathetic critic might say that his lack of mastery of English was responsible for it; a more unbiased view would be that he showed an extraordinary far-sightedness and patriotism by deciding to use a medium of expression which would be easily read by those for whom it was meant. It helped the many-sided growth of Hindi literature and enabled it to become the medium of expression for research work of a high order. He incidentally drew attention to the historical literature in various languages of India. The Hindi Sahitya Sammelan felicitated him with a presentation volume of essays on his completion of seventy years.

Gaurishanker Hirachand Ojha was a great pioneer in the study of the history of Rajasthan. As a historian who brought to light vast untapped sources lying in Rajasthan, he is without a peer. Various other institutions have been able to achieve similar feats, but only after a number of scholars had pooled their energies to follow the example he had set. Judged either by his private collections or by the collections that he secured for the Rajputana Museum at Ajmer, his energy and hard work are highly commendable. Though he was denied the benefit of a regular advanced academic training he had yet sharpened his knowledge of Sanskrit by frequent discussions with Sanskrit scholars.

He was the first to lay emphasis on the study of inscriptions as a source for the study of the history of Rajasthan. His work as a historian was of a

particular value to scholarship in the field of epigraphical research. He felt indignant at some of the wrong conclusions drawn by historians ignorant of epigraphic evidence, which was essential for investigation. He gave a powerful impetus to the cause of epigraphical research. He undertook extensive tours in Rajputana, initially on foot, and had tremendous capacity and stamina to withstand hardships. He collected innumerable coins and inscriptions and gathered information about ancient sites by talking to aged people. He was an avid explorer of temples, ruins, forts and battle-fields. The ancient inscriptions, copperplates, pattas and parwanas which had remained a sealed book to others revealed their meaning easily to him. Thus equipped with detailed information obtained direct from the sources, he was able to throw light on many little known events of Rajasthan history, and was able to quote documents and material which had remained hitherto untouched.

Ojha himself has often expressed his indebtedness to Tod in exciting his interest in the history of Rajputana. However, as regards methodology and the treatment of history, Ojha was considerably influenced by Erskine and his Gazetteers. As for the art of sifting historical evidence, his real teacher was Syamaldas, though Ojha has not been charitable to his Guru. In fact, he turned out at times to be hostile.[36] It is believed that Ojha might have been responsible, the manner and reason remaining unknown, for getting Syamaldas's *Vir Vinod* dumped in the royal storehouse till he had secured a place for himself and his intended history of Rajputana. It is a pity that Ojha did not acknowledge his indebtedness to Syamaldas for his various original ideas. These ideas have been passed on to posterity as his own, partly because they were first known under his name (Ojha's history of Rajputana was made public earlier) and partly because he adopted a style of citing footnotes which had not been adopted by Syamaldas.

Ojha's appreciation of Tod was differently motivated. He thought that it would endear him to the British. He differed from Tod in various essential facts of history and to him goes the credit of exposing Tod's inaccuracies which had passed into history. The writers of the various 'khyats' and 'vamshavalis' did not have the advantage of studying Tod and did not have the facility of contradicting him. It was only when Ojha pointed out that the 'khyats' on which Tod had based his *Annals and Antiquities* had been written in the latter half of the 17th century that Tod's value as a source of history fell to the ground.

Ojha has repeatedly asserted, in his prefaces to the various volumes of the history of Rajputana, that he had been trying to seek the truth and nothing but the truth, and he did not hesitate to criticise the Rajputs where they had been praised by Tod. He believed that the business of a scholar was to narrate plain and unvarnished truth. But this assertion needs to be qualified to a great extent. His impartiality and regard for truth is largely confined to the ancient period where inscriptions were the

source-material, excepting the question of the Kshatriya origin of the Guhils.[37]

He ceased to be impartial where the British Government was in the picture. In fact, this pro-British attitude coloured Ojha's vision so much that he even outdid the British themselves. He was full of praise, enough and to spare, for the Bikaner state because the Bikaner ruler, Maharaja Ganga Singh, had immense influence with the British and was on very good terms with them. The British were annoyed with Man Singh of Jodhpur; hence Ojha's estimate of that ruler is very much vitiated.

The real reason for the Rajput rulers seeking British protection has been deliberately misrepresented. Ojha had a pet theory that the Rajput states had been devastated by the Marathas and that, had the British not come forward, they would have been annexed by the Marathas. The Rajput rulers sought British protection primarily with a view to seeking, according to Ojha, shelter against Maratha invasions. Anyone who cares to go through the various volumes of Ojha's history would find that the real cause of the destruction of Rajputana was the rivalry between the feudal nobility in the states—the Saktawats and the Chundawats in Mewar, the supporters of rival candidates in the various states, and the invitation of the Marathas by the Rajput nobility to interfere in their internal disputes. In fact, almost all the treaties of 1818 between the Rajput states and the British have a clause that the British Government would not protect, harbour and support the nobility against the rulers, and would, on the other hand, support the rulers in crushing the refractory nobility. Each volume of his *Rajputana ka itihas* is full of evidence to support this contention. The history of Bikaner gives the most conclusive evidence because here no Maratha invasion had taken place, and yet the state was, as compared to the others in financial matters and maintenance of law and order, in no better condition in 1818. The burden of Ojha's song was English superiority and this appealed to the people who counted at that time.

As a historian, Gaurishanker Ojha belonged to the 'Nuda Veritas' school of history. He believed that facts and facts alone were the life of history. He was imbued with an unequalled zeal for dates and details of historical facts; he was not as much interested in presenting them adequately. Facts had a value in his eyes which amounted almost to a religious reverence. To him facts were not the dross of history but the true metal and the historian was a worker in that metal. To him the writing of history was only the art of collecting historical materials and furnishing details. He was ignorant of the science of history and confined himself only to the role of a biographer interested in a mere compilation of facts and dates. His strength lay in his meticulous care for sources and his taste for hard work. He attempted to reduce history to nothing more than a chronicle of war and royal genealogies.

Ojha was himself a product of his times, a loyal servant, first of Udaipur and then of the British. What he wrote was a complete reflection of his notions, bias and interests. While Ojha's work has great value in bringing to light innumerable new facts of Rajasthan history, it is naturally deficient from a more modern view of what history ought to be. His training and education *ipso facto* limited his scope. He did not devote his attention to the social and economic problems of Rajasthan history. He succeeded in avoiding any historical writing that offended the most conservative interest in Rajputana of his own time. He approached history in the spirit of a dissecting physiologist. He had a thorough distrust of tradition and of everything that could not be substantiated. But in his zeal to reject the bardic tales, he sometimes failed to appreciate the grains of truth which were contained in poetical legends.

Ojha had expressed a hope that his history of Rajputana would induce some young scholars to undertake further researches into Rajasthan history. The hope has been fulfilled. A band of scholars is now devoted to the utilisation of Rajasthani records in reconstructing a comprehensive history of Rajasthan and in correcting the mistakes of Persian historians.

REFERENCES

1. *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. I, p. 42.
2. This is because he considered the *Prithviraj Raso* to be a work of the 16th century.
3. *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. I, pp. 79-81.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 292.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 369-84; *Udaipur rajya ka itihas*, vol. I, pp. 70-85.
6. *Udaipur rajya ka itihas*, vol. I, pp. 104-05.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 164.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 171-72.
9. The first volume of *Udaipur rajya ka itihas* contained 240 pages from the first volume of *Rajputana ka itihas* (pp. 305-544) and included 276 pages from the second volume of *Rajputana ka itihas* (pp. 545-821).
10. *Udaipur rajya ka itihas*, vol. I, Preface, p. 2.
11. *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 671.
12. The rulers between 1710 and 1828 were: Sangram Singh II, Jagat Singh II, Pratap Singh II, Raj Singh II, Ari Singh II, Hammir Singh II, and Bhim Singh. Ojha's estimate of them itself proved the point.
13. *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 629-30.
14. *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 703.
15. *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 605.
16. *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. III, pt. I, pp. 27-29. Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, vol. I, pp. 303-06. M. M. Syamaldas, *Vir Vinod*, pt. I, pp. 273, 288. K. D. Erskine, *A Gazetteer of the Dungarpur State*, pp. 131-32.

17. *Udaipur rajya ka itihas*, vol. I, pp. 145-46.
18. *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. III, pt. II, pp. 44-63.
19. *Ibid.*, Preface, pp. 3-5.
20. *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. III, pt. I, pp. 142-45; *ibid.*, vol. III, pt. II, pp. 150-54.
21. *Ibid.*, pt. I, p. 149.
22. *Ibid.*, pt. II, pp. 192-93.
23. *Ibid.*, vol. III, pt. III, Preface, p. 5.
24. *Ibid.*, vol. IV, pt. I, pp. 135-45.
25. *Ibid.*, Preface, p. 4.
26. *Ibid.*, vol. IV, pt. II, pp. 695-705.
27. In his first volume of *Rajputana ka itihas*, published in 1924, he had said that Akbar established superiority over Bikaner (p. 277). But time had changed his version now. *Ibid.*, vol. V, pt. I, p. 162.
28. *Ojha Nibandh Sangrah*, vol. II, pp. 78-128.
29. *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 86-90; vol. II, pp. 154-67.
30. *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 247-57.
31. *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 258-71.
32. *Ibid.*, vol. III, pp. 35-39.
33. *Ibid.*, vol. III, pp. 51-59.
34. *Ibid.*, vol. III, pp. 81-85.
35. *Rajputana ka itihas*, vol. V, pt. I, p. 163.
36. Preface to *History of Udaipur*, vol. I, pp. 8-9.
37. There was considerable evidence for the Brahmanical origin of the Guhils but Ojha deliberately ignored such evidence. For an elaboration of the point see G. N. Sharma, "The Fragmentary Second Slab of Kumbhalgarh Inscription v.s. 1517" (*Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, 1951).

KRISHNALAL MOHANLAL JHAVERI

DR. C. R. NAIK

(Gujarat University, Ahmedabad)

LONG life is an opportunity for the individual to pursue his work and to prove his worth. And a prolonged existence, if it is dynamic and useful, is something worthwhile possessing. The life of late Diwan Bahadur Krishnalal Mohanlal Jhaveri fully illustrates this truth.

He was born on 30 December 1868 at Broach, the headquarters of a somewhat unattractive district, a decaying town reminiscent of a prosperous port which no longer exists.

He was brought up in the atmosphere of learning and education. His grandfather, Ranchhoddas Girdharbhai, was considered the father of modern education in Gujarat, and his father, Rao Bahadur Mohanlal, was one of the pioneers of the modern form of Gujarati education.

When Krishnalal attained the school-going age, Rao Bahadur Mohanlal focussed his attention on the arrangement for his studies and was particular in looking after his day-to-day progress. Krishnalal had a sharp intellect and a wonderful retentive memory. He was never idle. He could thoroughly grasp whatever he was taught.

In those days, the classical language was one of the compulsory subjects from the fourth standard of the secondary schools. His eldest brother, Motilal, advised him to take up Persian as he himself had chosen to study Sanskrit.

Krishnalal passed his Matriculation examination with credit and he was awarded the Percival Scholarship. In 1889 he passed, with Persian as the optional subject, his B.A. examination of the Bombay University in the First Class winning Gaurishankar Gold Medal. He was also awarded the Dakshina Fellowship with the monthly stipend of Rs. 60/- by Mr. Wordsworth, the then Principal of the Elphinstone College, Bombay. He studied for M.A. with English as the principal language under Wordsworth and Persian as the second language under the eminent professor of Persian, Mirza Hairat, the author of the monumental work of history of Persia in Persian, named *Tarikh-i-Iran*. After he got that degree, he was appointed a lecturer in Persian in the same college as an assistant to Professor Mirza Hairat.

He then passed his L.L.B. examination winning the Perry Prize in Jurisprudence.

In 1893 he got himself enrolled as an advocate on the appellate side of the High Court of Bombay and continued practice up to 1905. During the period, the then Chief Justice of the High Court, Sir Lawrence

Jenkins, was so much impressed with his accomplishments and court etiquette that he persuaded him to accept the post of the judge of the Presidency Court of Small Causes, which had fallen vacant at that time; and on his recommendation, the appointment was made.

From there he had gradual rise and ultimately he attained the position of the Chief Judge of the same court in 1918. He adorned that chair up to December, 1928 when he retired.

The title of Diwan Bahadur was conferred upon him in June, 1929 in appreciation of his glorious career.

Diwan Bahadur died (15 June, 1957) a comparatively lonely man afflicted in his last years by the death of his life-companion, his wife.

He was a man of mediocre size. His body was sound and well-built. He came from the Dasha Modh Bania Community and he remained one throughout his life, at least in his dress. He covered his head with the Bharuchi Majmudarshahi 'paghadi' (turban) and this gave distinction and colour to his personality.

He was a man of noble nature, a devoted husband and a lovable friend.

Full of humility, this ardent devotee of learning, always courteous and always smiling, was content with living a simple and honest life, using his gifts to the betterment of those who came into his contact.

He led a busy life. He played important roles in diverse spheres—forensic, social, educational and literary.

As a judge, he always brought to bear a humane outlook on the judicious disposal of cases with restraint and firmness in cross-examination.

Furthermore, he had developed the supreme virtue of tact, by means of which he could bring about the compromise of differing view-points in matters of dispute. One illuminating example thereof is noted here. In August, 1929 the Ahmedabad Labour Association applied to the Mill -Owners' Association to restore the wage-cut of 1923 as the mills were making high profits as compared to 1923. But the demand was rejected. This dispute was referred to the Permanent Arbitration Board, one of whose members was Mahatma Gandhi. He did not agree with his co-arbitrator, Sheth Mangaldas Girdhardas. So this question was referred to Diwan Bahadur as an umpire. After hearing respective contentions and investigating into all details, the award which he gave on 3 December, 1929 was so balanced that it fully satisfied the employers; and Gandhiji appealed to the workers to accept thankfully what Diwan Bahadur had allowed and to work perseveringly and peacefully.

The city of Bombay and the present Gujarat State were the main centres of Diwan Bahadur's multifarious activities. He was intimately connected with more than fifty institutions, humanitarian, cultural, literary and educational—like the Social Service League, the Indian Red Cross Society, the Dadabhai Naoroji Memorial Committee, the Gujarat Research

Society, the Gujarat Sahitya Parishad, the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, the Urdu Research Institute, the Gyan Pracharak Mandali, the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, the P.E.N. All India Centre and the Victoria Memorial School for the Blind as President, Trustee, Treasurer or a Member.

He was attached to the Bombay University as a Fellow (1928-51) and as a member of its various bodies and Committees. His contribution was of great importance to the development and progress of female education initiated by Maharshi Karve. He was elected Vice-Chancellor of Shrimati Nathibai Damodar Women's University in 1952 and he worked in that capacity up to 1956.

In the field of social reform, he showed a liberalism that could not fail to command respect for him from ardent social reformers of his times.

Whether it was a question of high scholarship or difficult administrative problems, whether it referred to an institution or to an individual, one could rely on him for guidance and advice which flowed from his long experience and from his disinterested and catholic outlook.

His unfailing attendance at meetings was remarkable. He was punctuality personified. His presence helped harmonious and expeditious disposal of business. He had wonderful equanimity and he always acted as a soothing and synthesizing force. Besides, he did not permit himself to vitiate his consideration of problems that came before him.

Diwan Bahadur occupies a prominent place in the shining galaxy of the literary firmament of Western India. His relations with late Sir Harsiddhbhai Divatia and Dr. K. M. Munshi were very friendly. They loved and respected one another by reason of a common ideal and interest for literature. This attachment was so strong till the end that none of the trio could suffer separation from one another and could be happy in the absence of the remaining two.

Diwan Bahadur Krishnalal Mohanlal Jhaveri was the first to write a systematic history of the Gujarati literature. His two volumes on the subject, entitled *Milestones in Gujarati Literature* and *Further Milestones in Gujarati Literature*, even today occupy a very important place in Gujarati literature. The first one contains the history of the Gujarati literature of the old period, and the second one that of the modern period. They present to the English-reading public an authentic and connected history of the Gujarati literature. It must be said to the credit of the author that he succeeded in producing a memorable record, reliable in facts and figures, impartial in the treatment and just in the assessments.

Diwan Bahadur's *Present State of Gujarati Literature* is the publication of a course of five lectures which he was invited by the Bombay University to deliver under the scheme of 'Thakkar Vassanji Madhavji Lectures' on

22, 23, 24, 26 and 27 February, 1934. They were meant to acquaint those who were not in direct touch with the literature of Gujarati, one of the most important vernaculars of India.

The Development of Gujarati Literature is a collection of the reviews of the new publications in Gujarati which Diwan Bahadur contributed to the *Modern Review,* the well-known periodical, with unfailing regularity for fifty years.

As said before, Diwan Bahadur was a profound scholar of Persian. He was very fond of procuring and reading Persian manuscripts and documents and deciphering the writings on coins and inscriptions, thereby giving new historical materials to the scholars of the subject. For example, his treatise in Gujarati named *Farsi Grantho* (Persian books written by Gujaratis) contains short biographies of the Hindus of Gujarat with the contributions made by them to the Persian literature. It is based on the materials gathered by him from Persian manuscripts.

His another work of the type is *Imperial Farmans.* The Mughal emperor, Akbar the Great (A.D. 1556-1605), was very much impressed with the learning and piety of His Holiness the 'Mahant' of the temple of Shrinathji at Nathdwara situated near Udaipur in Rajasthan, named Shri Vitthaleshwara Deekshita Maharaj, the second son of Vallabhacharya, the religious head of the rich Bhatia, Lohana, Bania and Marwadi merchants. Akbar's successors from Shah Jahan right up to Shah 'Alam continued to show the same kind of favour to the Mahant's descendants, were anxious to redress their slightest grievance, and conferred grants in the form of 'farmans' written in Persian. Shri Mulchand Tribhovan Telivala, a Sanskrit scholar of outstanding merit, the then tower of strength to the Sampradaya, suggested the idea of having those farmans published and edited in order that the public might realize the great regard in which the Head of the Sampradaya was held by the Mughal emperors. Diwan Bahadur took up the suggestion as a labour of love and accomplished the task with great credit. The volume (published in 1928) contains the text of the farmans (A.D. 1577–1805) with translations in English, Hindi and Gujarati as well as notes to clarify certain important items.

'Ali Muhammad Khan, the last of 'the imperial divans of Gujarat', had written in A.D. 1761 the *Mir'at-i-Ahmadi* (the Mirror of Ahmad, i.e. of the Suba of Ahmadabad, Gujarat), the most valuable among numerous historical chronicles in Persian written in and about Gujarat. Diwan Bahadur undertook to translate the work into Gujarati in view of its importance for the Gujarati-knowing scholars interested in the history of Gujarat and the rendering of one volume of the work was published in 1933-35.

To simplify the tough subject of theories of Persian rhyme, metre and rhetoric for the scholars of Persian, Diwan Bahadur wrote (1890) a valuable digest of the subject entitled *Outlines of Persian Prosody with Figures*

of Speech. He has presented it in a simple language giving copious and varied illustrations.

He translated (1890) into English fifty ghazals from the Tayyabat (Purities) of the celebrated poet of Persia, Sa'di Shirazi, the prophet in the sphere of Persian ghazal (d. 1291). This work named *Translation into English of Sa'di's Tayyabat* is the English rendering of such ghazals of Sa'di which are plain and are very popular and by singing which the ignorant muleteers beguile the tedium of the road.

He also translated (1892) into English two hundred ghazals of Hafiz, the last of the great Sufi poets of Persia (d. 1389-90) under the title *Diwan-i -Hafiz translated into English*. This is the rendering of the sweetest songs selected by him.

In all these works of translation, Diwan Bahadur restricted his job to presenting the text truthfully. He entered the spirit of the original and never stepped beyond the bounds of propriety. His is an artistic rendering of a work from one language into another. As such, they read like the texts written originally in the language in which it is translated.

Diwan Bahadur has traced in his treatise entitled *Introduction to the Anwar-i-Suhaili* (Lights of Canopus) the history of the origin of the original work and its various versions (1892). The Fables of Bidpai (or Vidyapati) were originally translated from Sanskrit into Pahlawi from which it was rendered into Arabic and from it into Persian. Diwan Bahadur has given a detailed account of this history from its origin up to the version of the *Anwar-i-Suhaili*.

To facilitate the study of the Akhpag-i-Muhsini (Muhsin's Ethics) of the same author for the students of Persian, he wrote a booklet containing illuminating explanatory notes under the title of *Notes and Commentary on the Akhlaq-i-Muhsini* (1892).

Over and above the works mentioned already, his following works are noteworthy:

Those in Gujarati are: *Haidar 'Ali and Tipu Sultan* (1894), *Dayaram and Hafiz* (the former, an eminent mystic poet of Gujarat and the latter, a celebrated Sufi poet of Iran) (1895), *Aurangzib and Rajputs* (1896), *Muhsininan Nitivachano* (Muhsin's ethical sayings) (1895), *Krishna-Charitra* (1908); and those in English include *Shivaji or the Dawn of Maratha Empire* (1898).

The Forbe Sahitya Sabha of Bombay has published a collection of his addresses, essays and articles. They cover a wide range of interest; but the subjects are mostly related to Persian and Gujarati language and literature, history and culture. They are of such quality that the perusal thereof leaves a lasting impression on the mind of the reader.

When his works are scrutinized and analysed, it can be safely concluded that he was mainly a student of history and as such he derived maximum pleasure in studying and promoting the study of subjects connected with history.

When Diwan Bahadur strode into his seventy-fifth year, people who loved and admired him celebrated and commemorated his jubilee. In it, several eminent people paid glorious tributes to what he had been and to what he had done in different fields. Diwan Bahadur drew inspiration from the motto 'knowledge is power' which he had got transcribed on his letter-head; he was known as the Grand Old Man of the Bombay University in the University circle; he enjoyed the privilege of the address of Kaka (uncle) by the Hindu members of the literary family and that of Jhaverisaheb by his friends of other communities; he rightly deserved the appellation of Ajatasatru given to him by Dr. K. M. Munshi, a devout interpreter of the East.

DURGASHANKAR K. SHASTRI

DR. R. N. MEHTA

(University of Baroda)

DURGASHANKAR KEVALRAM SHASTRI (24 January 1882-29 September 1952) is well known as a historian in Gujarat because of his contributions in many journals in Gujarati as well as his larger works. In this paper an effort is made to present his personality, literary activities and historiography.[1].

Durgashankar Kevalram Shastri was born in the Prasonra branch of the Nagar Brahmins at Jamnagar on 24 January 1882. In the nineteenth century Prasnora Brahmins maintained themselves by reading and reciting religious works, medical practice, state services, etc. These activities promoted academic interest in many youths of this branch resulting in the splendid achievements of Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji, Durgashankar Shastri and many other scholars.

Durgashankar's father, Kevalram Shastri, was a teacher in the Sanskrit Pathshala at Gondal and hence young Durgashankar started his career as a student at Gondal. He studied up to the sixth standard which is equal to the present-day tenth class. He failed and gave up his regular studies. He was advised by his teacher Himmatlal Ganeshji Anjaria to continue his Sanskrit studies. This he did under his father. The study of Sanskrit, specially of literature, developed his scholarly abilities and he began reading extensively great works in Sanskrit, Gujarati and English.

This extensive reading gave him the necessary background for his chief interests which centred upon mainly two subjects, History and Medicine, which were to mature later in his life.

After 1900 A.D. his father retired from active service. This led to economic depression in the family of Durgashankar and he had to start thinking about earning his livelihood. Some of his relatives helped him to obtain a scholarship of Rs. 10/- per month to study in the Laxman Meram Chemical Laboratory at Rajkot. Durgashankar completed the study in 1903 but he could not get any suitable job, so he went to Bombay in 1904 and worked for some time in the General Post Office but gave up the job in 1905 and returned to Jamnagar.

From Jamnagar he went to Bhavanagar and stayed with his maternal uncle. There he came in contact with Manishankar Ratanji Bhatt, a well-known Gujarati poet under the nickname Kant. He encouraged young Durgashankar to study and translate Rig Veda. Durgashankar seems to have been busy reading and translating till 1901. This was the crucial year of change in the life of Durgashankar. His brother-in-law, Jugatram,

established Zandu Pharmacy in that year. Durgashankar joined this firm and continued to work there till the end of his life.

As soon as his pecuniary difficulties were over, Durgashankar's scholarly tastes began developing rapidly together with an increase in the activity of writing at Bombay. Zandu Pharmacy became a centre of persons of literary taste which included, besides Durgashankar, Bhagwanlal Girjashankar Bhatt, Mohanlal and Jugatram.

This group attracted the attention of Tansukhram Mansukhram Tripathi, one of the organisers and first secretary of the Forbes Sabha, Bombay. This institute had planned a study of various religious sects, their influence in Gujarat and their literary activities in Gujarat from 1913.[2] Under this scheme essays were invited and the best essay was selected, the author was given a prize of Rs. 500/- and that essay was printed. The anouncement on the History of Vaisnavism was shown to Durgashankar by Tansukhram who suggested to him to write the essay. The Vaisnava traditions were known to Durgashankar as his forefathers for a few generations were patronised by Vaisnava acharyas at Jamnagar. Durgashankar decided to try and wrote the short History of Vaisnavism and won the award. This led to the printing of the 1st edition. The work has undergone two editions. In this series Durgashankar wrote History of Saivism also and it was published by him in 1925.[3]

Now Durgashankar's reputation as a historian was established in Gujarat. His interest in Sanskrit had led him to the study of the Puranas. As a result of the long study in 1931 his *Purana Vinechana* was published by the Gujarat Vidya Sabha of Ahmedabad. He wrote this work with a view to give general information on the Puranas specially with a historical perspective, as such a work did not exist in Gujarati literature.[4]

Along with this interest in religious literature and religious history, Durgashankar was interested is social history. This led to his writing of an essay on the "Prasnora Gnati nu Digdarshana" in 1922 and it was revised in 1937. His affiliation to this subcaste of the Nagars was the fountain-head for writing the biography of Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji. Durgashankar was attracted to the political history and therefore he had translated *Jain prabandhas* which record the life of Gujarat rulers. His translations[5] and edition[6] of *Prabandha Cintamani* and his essay on "Gujaratna Madhyakalin Hindu Rajput Yugana Itihasa na Prabhandhatmaka Sadhano", written in 1932, point to his interest in such works.

These efforts led to the production of *Madhyakalin Rajput Itihasa,* published in two parts in 1937 and 1939. This work has run into two editions.

Besides these major works, he wrote many essays on topical interests that were collected in *Aitihasika Samsodhana*[7] and posthumously in *Apani Samskriti na Ketalank Vaheno.*[8]

Durgashankar Shastri had joined the Zandu Pharmacy. He was trained as a scholar in Laxman Meram Laboratory at Rajkot and hence

his interest in medicine was professional. He, therefore, actively worked in this branch by editing a monthly journal, the *Ayurveda Vijnana*, from 1917 to 1940. He later on wrote a history of Ayurveda in 1942 and also a biography of Zandu Bhatta whose name the Pharmacy cherishes.

As a result of Durgashankar's activities he was invited to deliver Thakkar Vasanji Madhavaji Vyakhyan of the University of Bombay where he delivered his lectures on "Bharatiya Samskaro Ane tenu Gujarat ma Avatarana".

Thus as a historian he carried his activities in the religious, social, cultural, political and medical fields throughout his life. He had developed his own concepts about history and the source of history, and his historiography followed certain patterns which require careful evaluation.

Durgashankar tried to express his views on what is History in an essay on "Aitihasika Dristi" and "Gujarati Aithihasika Sahitya". In these essays he tried to maintain the following points: (i) A historical perspective offers us a view of the past as it was; (ii) A research worker in history and a writer of history should follow the methods of a scientific worker and his perspective should be without any pride, preconceived notions of love and hatred and free from selfish sentiments and he should be judicial and truth -loving.

He is also conscious of the pitfalls that obstruct or colour the vision of the past. For these overtones or undertones Durgashankar points out that pride generated by the following reasons and a few more causes are responsible: (i) Pride and its reasons: (a) Religion, (b) Country or people (nation), (c) Jati or Race, (d) Caste, (e) Tradition; (ii) Pleader's viewpoint; and (iii) Propagandist's viewpoint.

These ideas are noted at random in his papers, but a systematic treatment of the meaning of history, evaluation of sources and other philosophico -methodological aspects have not been treated by him in greater details. It could be seen from his notions of history that he tried to uphold the ideal of objectivity in history that he had imbibed through his reading and study and that he tried to maintain the ideal set before him as best as he could. The sheer objectivity and the scientific method that Durgashankar tried to emulate probably came to him through the works that were popular in the last decade of the 19th and the beginning of the present century.

His historiography however indicates two other trends: (i) His notion of the beginning of every subject from the Vedic times; and (ii) Acceptance of the evolutionary trend of thought.

If all these scattered thoughts are combined while trying to understand the background of Durgashankar's works, one is inclined to feel that his historical perspective has certain evolutionary tones. His tremendous enthusiasm for Western ideas of history always led him to accept the charge that there was no historical writing of the Western Unilinear variety in India.

In trying to relate various aspects of Indian life, culture and history to the ideals that were fixed in his mind, he used the following methods: (1) Presenting the problem; (2) Presenting the evidence; (3) Discussion of these evidences; and (4) Judgements found on the basis of available evidence.

In using these methods, the titles of his subjects are usually self -explanatory. He presents the problem under discussion in the first paragraph or chapter and then he tries to present his evidence and discuss it.

In presenting the evidence for history he usually relies on literary documents. The literary evidence mainly comes from Sanskrit and Gujarati, but he utilised Marathi, English and such other languages as and when necessary. He presents his data clearly and precisely and discusses them in necessary details. The critical apparatus of Durgashankar for accepting the document as historical is based on the literary references and his arguments are also chiefly based on it, as could be clearly seen from his works like *Purana Vivecana*, *Madhyakalin Rajput Itihasa* and many articles written by him.

While accepting the literary sources for his work his main point of argument turns towards chronology and reliability.

His efforts at fixing the chronology were always based upon the literary references. After that he considered the probability of situation and reliability and from this angle he criticised many old authors. His remarks on *Dantakatha Itihasa* in his *Gujarat no Madhyakalin Itihasa*[9] are indicative of his strong views on the subject. He clearly offers two criteria for accepting the reliability of the stories. One of them is non-acceptance of impossible and exaggerated version and the other is that it should not be contradicted by any historical condition.

As a further elucidation of the reliability he made out the following points: (1) Written folk-tale is more reliable than the unwritten ones. Among the written versions one that is nearer in time to the event is often more reliable, but sometimes the later version is more reliable. (2) The tale that is found uniformly in most of the Prabandhas is more reliable. (3) When Prabandhas contradict themselves, one that is in conformity with the inscriptions, historical conditions, etc. is more reliable. (4) The tales should be accepted as reliable if they stand the test of independent examination.

He is very conscious of the misuse of tradition and folk-tales and held a firm belief that they would overpower history and hence he advocates much care before accepting traditions and folk-tales as history. In spite of this care he is conscious of the fact that the degree of reliability of a verbal tradition varied from person to person.

The conclusions and judgements that Durgashankar has given in his writings are essentially of three different categories.

The first type of judgements is based on clearly understanding the purpose of the production of earlier data. As his grasp of the motivation of

the ancient and mediaeval writers was fairly sound, he clearly distinguished the avarice, praise of one's religion and other viewpoints of the authors and gives sound judgements.

The literary data and criticism have their own limitations. When Durgashankar handles such a situation, the judgements given by him were much less reliable than the first category. Here his appreciation of the use of Pauranic data by authors like *Ratnanamirao-jote* is pertinent. This evaluation could not be supported by the later researches.

But his ability to visualise what was historically probable often led him to correctly evaluate the highly imaginative literature that was being published.[10] In such cases he remarks that more evidence is essential before accepting such literature.

The third category of his judgements traces the factors of indecision based either on the lack of data[11] or checking non-literary evidence.[12] This healthy indecision would, according to him, continue till reliable evidence was forthcoming.

With the methodology used by Durgashankar Shastri, he tried to expound his idea of history on one side, whereas on other side he used this discipline for giving a sense of temporal dimension and throwing some light on the burning problems of the day. In these efforts he had some notions about Indian history in general and history of Gujarat in particular. When the literature produced by him is evaluated, some of his notions could be followed in broad outlines as detailed below:

(i) He tries to link most of the studies with Vedic literature or gives historical perspectives.

(ii) He had certain notions about the dichotomy of Indian society.

(iii) Emphasis on Indian culture and its evaluation in present-day conditions.

(iv) Degeneration of Indian culture and the need for change.

(v) Replacement of traditions by sober historical approach.

(vi) Emphasis on historical records.

(vii) Concentration on history and culture of Gujarat against the wider background of Indian culture.

(viii) Beneficial effects of historical studies.

The perusal of the history of Ayurveda, or his histories of Saivism, Vaisnavism and such other works reveals his concern for connecting the modern practices through a series of references to the Vedic literature. In some of his articles on social practices these ideas could be clearly seen. This is a natural effect of the sources that are preserved and have been utilised in the construction of the linear patterns of chronology for understanding the change and other factors.

His other characteristic also springs from the same element. Whenever he tries to take up a problem he usually tries to trace its development from

its origin, actual or inferred, to the period or of the point in time at which the problem was posed. In this way he tries to give necessary time perspective to the problem that he handles. This characteristic could be illustrated by many of his historical articles.

The conflicts of races, specially the Aryan and non-Aryan, is a theme to which Durgashankar comes in his lectures on Bhartiya Samskritinu Gujarat ma Avatarana, but here his arguments are more tradition-centred in making the Aryans migrate and their clash and conquest. This pattern formed by the 19th century historiographers is closely followed by him, without detailed analysis.

This characteristic is related to his other ideas about Indian culture. It seems that according to him he believed some important elements of Indian culture were clearly developed in Mahabharata period. Some of them were glorified by the prominent followers of Brahmin, Bauddha and Jain religions.[13] His training and background were brahmanic traditions preserved in the Prasnora Brahmanas from Saurastra. This naturally gave him a good advantage in this aspect of Indian culture. He has, as a result of this, written extensively about Brahmin religion, society, tirthas, sadhus and numerous other topics. When he writes about the many aspects of these topics he usually tries to relate them wherever possible to the present -day conditions.

Moreover, he observed the present-day problems and tried to give historical depth, by the study of relevant traditions and literature, as could be seen from his articles like "Balatkare Vatalelan no Dharma ma Punah Pravesa."[14]

In this interaction of the situation of the living present with the bygone days Durgashankar felt with many others that the past was better and glorious. From this elevated position by stages the Indian society degenerated into the corrupt 19th and 20th century society in which he was living. He has clearly given his view on this aspect in his interesting essay on "Bhartiya Buddhi Ni Avanati No Krama."[15] From this point of view he notes that from about 9th century B.C. to about 9th century A.D., a period of about seventeen centuries is the brilliant epoch. Within this period the most brilliant part according to him was a period from 200 B.C. to 200 A.D.[16] After 9th century A.D. is a period of degeneration which continued according to him up to 19th century A.D. He tries to emphasise this by presenting examples from different subjects of study.

As a corollary to the theme of degeneration of culture, Durgashankar tries to evaluate the present efforts of cultural regeneration in an optimistic way, emphasising the will to change and the effort needed. This is clearly manifest in most of his historical writings where he deals with the present situations and evaluates them. His analysis of 'Suvarnayuga Na Sarjan',[17] or 'Parisadni Purani Pratha'[18] are just some instances of his opinion about this regeneration. Durgashankar, who firmly believed in the

regeneration of Indian culture in the present efforts, was highly impressed by the efforts of his age and specially by the work of Mahatma Gandhi.

Durgashankar believed, as already noted, that Indians had no sense of history. He tried to bring this sense and continuously fought against the misuse of folklore and other aspects of interpreting the past. His continuous struggle is seen in most of his interpretations and he usually leaves no chance to criticise the lack of historic, specially temporal, perspective, exaggeration and false values wherever he meets them. But when he is engaged in such an activity his sympathies with ancient India remain strong. He even goes forward to criticise the seeming misinterpretations[19] and exaggerations of certain periods in the Western historical writings. His continuous efforts to bring out the ideals of history as accepted by him are worthy of record.

As he believes that history is to be constructed out of the past records, he had emphasised the need of preserving the old records in his article "Prachin Vastuo Na Samgrahani ane teni Nodhani Avasyakat".[20] He advocates the field studies, collection and preservation of historical documents for interpretation of history. A study of this essay, however, indicates that he does not go much beyond inscriptions, coins, standing architectural fragments and sculptures. But at a later stage he makes use of the archaeological investigations in the interpretation, often without a very clear grasp of the archaeological methods.

All these activities of Durgashankar had the main emphasis on the activities in Gujarat. He looked upon this geographical unit of India as a sub-unit of Indian culture and hence he tried to bring the Indian cultural traits in the history and life of the people of Gujarat. He thinks of Indian history as a larger stage on which Gujarat had played its own role. When he discusses the all-India problems like the Saiva and Vaisnava movements he does not fail to bring out the reflections of these movements in Gujarat as well as the contribution of Gujarat to these movements.

This theme is elaborated by him in his lectures "Thakkar Madhavaji Vasanji Vyakhanas" delivered in the University of Bombay. In these five talks he discussed the Indian culture and its arrival in Gujarat. He devoted three lectures to a general survey of Indian culture and the remaining two he devoted to trace the impact of these cultural influences in Gujarat. While discussing the impact on Gujarat, he has compared the activities of Gujarat with different parts of the country and has tried to show the position of this part with that of the other parts of the country.

While pursuing the study of history, Durgashankar was thinking about the possible effects of this study. He has discussed this in his talk, "Aitihasika Samsodhana Ane Saurastra". He maintained in this article that history helps in understanding the present and helps one to take decisions for the future. Besides this it helps to throw interesting light on a number of subjects, develops critical judgements and helps to worship truth.

Durgashankar, as a historian, was much impressed by the historical sense as known in 19th/20th century historiography and tried to remain an objective historian. This objectivity was maintained by him whenever it was possible for him to do so. He did not go to extreme nationalistic history nor did he follow the view-point of Marxism or any other point of view for looking at the past as it was, as has been noted above, but this view had its own limitations with him.

In pursuing the historical studies, his works are concentrated on the periods where the evidence was available in Sanskrit or Gujarati or English. His contribution in the field of research of original documents except the literary ones is very insignificant, nor has he contributed to such subjects as epigraphy, numismatics or many other original sources of historical documents. His understanding of architecture or sculpture also is not much utilised in the documentation of history. Even though he made some sceptical remarks about the results of field-studies, he rightly warns the students not to be led away by certain conclusions. A perusal of his works reveals an author who was good at handling literary data and weak in field studies.

It must be said to the credit of this historian of Gujarat that he tried to write sober history and continuously waged a struggle against mythology, historical novels and folklore to save history as he understood it from falling into their clutches at a time when they passed as sober history. His struggle is not over yet, and hence his writings occupy an important position in the historical literature of Gujarat, as they show a good approach and a lucid style of a scientific worker in the field.

REFERENCES

1. A good account of his life in Gujarati is found in *Apani Samskriti na Ketalank Vaheno*, which is a collection of the writings of Durgashankar Shastri, published by Vileparle Sahitya Sabha, 1953. As an introduction to this collection R. V. Pathak has given a brief sketch of the life of Durgashankar Shastri, which has given necessary data for this paper.
2. Durgashankar Shastri, *Vaisnava Dharma no Itihasa*, 2nd edition, p. 3.
3. Durgashankar Shastri, *Saiva Dharma no Itihasa, Prakashanka na be bola*, p. 4.
4. Durgashankar Shastri, *Puranavirecana, Upodghata*, p. 1.
5. Durgashankar Shastri, *Prabandha Cintamani*, Sanskrit edition, p. 1932.
6. Durgashankar Shastri, Translation of *Prabandha Cintamani*, 1934.
7. Durgashankar Shastri, *Aitihasika Samsodhana*, 1941.
8. Durgashankar Shastri, *Apani Samskriti na Ketalank Vaheno*, 1953.
9. Durgashankar Shastri, *Gujarat no Madhyakalin Itihasa*, 2nd edition, p. 8.
10. *Ibid.*

11. *Ibid.*, p. 615.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 657.
13. Durgashankar Shastri, *Bhartiya Samskaro Ane tenu Gujaratma Avatarana*, p. 9.
14. Durgashankar Shastri, *Apani Samskriti na Ketalank Valteno*, p. 170.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 158 ff.; also *Bhartiya Samskaro Anetenu Gujarat ma Avatara.*
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 160, 259 ff.
17. Durgashankar Shastri, *Apani Samskriti na Ketalank Vaheno*, p. 154.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 400.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 576.
20. Durgashankar Shastri, *Aitihasika Samsodhana*, p. 32.

ROMESH CHANDRA DUTT

DR. SUNIL SEN

(Rabindra Bharati University, Calcutta)

ROMESH CHANDRA DUTT was born in the house of the Dutts of Rambagan in North Calcutta on August 13, 1848. The Dutts of Rambagan occupied a prominent place in Bengal's social life. Western culture made a deep impression on the Dutts. Romesh Dutt's great-grandfather Nilmani Dutt had made his name as an "Anglicist" in the eighteenth century. His uncle Rasamoy Dutt was the first Principal of the Sanskrit College. His father Ishan Chandra Dutt was one of the first deputy collectors in Bengal. Toru Dutt, the famous poet, was his cousin. Like many of his contemporaries Romesh Dutt was drawn irresistibly towards the Anglicist current. When he was only twenty years of age he left for England with his two college friends, Surendranath Banerjee and Beharilal Gupta, to sit for the I.C.S. examination. The London sojourn marked the first turning-point in his life. He came in touch with western liberal ideas. John Bright, Henry Fawcett, John Stuart Mill and Charles Dickens made a deep impression on his mind. Dutt worked hard, preparing himself seriously for a career, and did very well in the Civil Service examination; he came third and secured very high marks in English and Sanskrit. He was also called to the Bar. In 1871 he returned to India and started his life as an assistant magistrate of 24-Parganas.

The second turning-point in Dutt's life came three years later, in 1874, when he met Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. Bankim asked him to write in Bengali "I hardly know Bengali style," said Dutt. "Style? Whatever a cultured man like you will write will be style," said Bankim Chandra in his usual grave voice. Dutt readily responded to Bankim's advice. Between 1874 and 1880 he wrote his four historical novels.

As Romesh Chandra Dutt wrote these historical novels he discovered India. While at Sahabajpur in Barisal district (now in Bangladesh), he read and re-read Grant Duff. When he went on tour in Tripura, Tod was his constant companion. At last Dutt felt that there was much in India that instinctively thrilled him. He had come to India via the west. Yet India was in his blood, and he undertook one of the noblest works in his life—the translation of the Rig Veda in Bengali. The orthodox Brahmin pundits, not unexpectedly, raised a hue and cry, and led a public campaign against him. But Dutt remained unperturbed and was happy that he received encouragement of a great man. Surely this man was Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar. The translation was completed

in 1885-87. Two years later he published his first major historical work, *A History of Civilisation in Ancient India* in three volumes. In 1893 he founded the famous Bangiya Sahitya Parishad, an association for the cultivation of Bengali literature, which exists even today. Romesh Chandra translated the *Mahabharata* into English in 1899, and the *Ramayana* in 1900.

Romesh Dutt worked as a civil servant from September 1871 to July 1897; he became a Magistrate and Collector in 1881, and a Commissioner in 1894. It seems that Dutt felt bitterly about racial discrimination, and wrote to his elder brother Jogesh Chandra in 1893: "if Government is not disposed to repose any real trust and confidence in me, I am free to utilise my powers and abilities, such as they are, to the benefit of my country in other ways." In fact, he took ten months' leave in January 1897, and did not go back in Government service. He went to England and worked as a lecturer in Indian history at the University College, London. Perhaps the most fruitful period of his life began then. It was during this period that he undertook research in India's economic history. He was then forty-nine. In 1897 came out a short historical sketch, *England and India*, which dealt with Indian famines, poverty of the people, and Government policy. The first volume of *The Economic History of India* was published in 1902, and the second volume in 1904. Dutt had already become a nationalist of the moderate variety represented by Gokhale and Surendranath. He was elected President of the Congress session at Lucknow in 1899. Next year he published his *Open Letters* to Lord Curzon on Famines and Land Assessments in India.

We now come to the last phase of Dutt's life. He returned to India in the middle of 1904 and served the Baroda State as Revenue Minister until 1907. He took his job very seriously and worked hard, trying to inject some imaginative quality into the humdrum tasks of administration in an Indian native state. He wrote about his "dreams" to Nivedita: "I am trying to relieve the agriculturists of excessive taxation on their land, I am endeavouring to get together capitalists to start new mills and industries, and if I can build up the Legislative Council I will make the work of the State proceed in the interests of the people, and in touch with the people. Everything will be open and above board—nothing done in dark, tortuous, secret, autocratic ways. Dreams—Dreams! Some will exclaim. Well, let them say so—it is better to dream of work and progress than to wake to inaction and stagnation." At fifty-six years of age, Dutt dreamt of "work and progress" in a native state and prepared meticulously the Baroda Administration Reports. Yet his dreams remained unfulfilled. The "autocratic ways" of this native state hardly changed in 1907. Although work in Baroda kept him busy, Dutt had not ceased to take interest in the growing national movement. In 1905 he presided

over the first session of the Indian Industrial Conference at Benares; in 1906 he was elected President of the Bombay Provincial Industrial Conference. He welcomed the Swadeshi movement which, he hoped, would "give a new impetus to our manufactures," and "will relieve millions of weavers and artisans from a state of semi-starvation in which they have lived." Romesh Dutt died at Baroda on November 30, 1909.[1]

English literature seemed to be Romesh Dutt's first love. He developed interest in Indian history when he wrote the historical novels. In 1865 came out Bankim's first historical novel, *Durgeshnandini*, which stirred the reading public. Evidently Dutt was influenced by Bankim and Scott, and he collected his material from Grant Duff and Tod. His historical novels cover about a hundred years of Indian history. *Bangabijeta*, the first novel in Dutt's tetralogy, begins with the Mughal conquest of Bengal; the hero is Todarmall who moves about in the villages, wins the heart of the Hindu zamindars, and proves to be the real conqueror of Bengal. In *Madhavi Kankan* the scene is Delhi that watched with helpless anguish the succession struggle, the court intrigues, and the final triumph of Aurangzeb. The central theme in *Maharashtra Jivan Prabhat* is the birth of the Maratha nation under the leadership of Shivaji, the hero of Indian nationalism. For years this novel stirred the minds of the Indian youth. *Rajput Jivan Sandhya*, an equally famous novel, is mainly based on Tod's *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*; the hero is Pratap Singh, who held aloft the banner of Rajput independence and achieved limited success. Dutt also wrote two social novels, *Sangsar* (1886) and *Samaj* (1894), in which he pleaded for widow-marriage and inter-caste marriage.

Romesh Dutt, a Sanskrit scholar, had already mastered Indian classics. In a revealing passage he noted the importance of literary evidence as source-material of India's social history: "The literature of every country, slowly expanding through successive ages, reflects accurately the manners and customs, the doings, and the thoughts of the people. And thus, although no work of a purely historical character has been left behind by the people of Ancient India, it is possible to gain from their works on literature and religion a fairly accurate idea of their civilization and the progress of their intellect and social institutions."[2]

His first major historical work, *A History of Civilization in Ancient India*, is based mainly on Sanskrit literature. In this book Dutt tried to discover the Indian mind and to understand India's social institutions. It was not, as Nivedita puts it, "a work of original scholarship," but was intended to be "an exposition to India and to the world, of the national glory." Following the footsteps of Max Müller, Dutt tried to draw the attention of the Indian people to the wonder that was India. To quote Nivedita again, it "was never meant to be more than a popular resume."[3]

This historical effort, however, attracted considerable attention, and Dutt won recognition as a nationalist historian.

In 1903 Romesh Dutt wrote from England to his college friend Beharilal Gupta about 'the great work' before him: "the great work before me is the second volume of my 'Economic History', and if I can finish that in the present year my life's literary work is done. My 'Ancient India', and 'Epics', and 'Economic History' will remain the most important productions of my rather prolific pen during the maturest period of my life, between forty and sixty."[4] Indeed Dutt's *Economic History* remains his greatest work which reveals his mastery over facts, keen observation and deep insight. It is based mainly on parliamentary papers and official reports; statistical materials have been used copiously to support general statements. It was thanks to Dutt's pioneering work that economic history as a discipline came into existence in this country and has since developed as a very flourishing sort of history. Even today Dutt's *Economic History* remains authoritative.

The present writer feels that India's economic history has to be rewritten in the light of contemporary economic thought; the modern student of economic history will ask new questions and follow new methodology. Yet it seems that some of the questions asked by Dutt are of great interest, and some of the formulations made by him remain valid even today, and have been substantiated by later researches.

Firstly, Dutt was the first Indian analyst who discovered that the basic cause of India's malady should be sought in the agrarian problem. In fact the agrarian question figures prominently in both the volumes of his *Economic History*. There is a brilliant summary account of the different types of land system that were created by the ruling class. He focussed attention on the high incidence of land tax which was not only excessive but also fluctuating and uncertain in many provinces. But land tax was only one aspect of the agrarian problem; no less important was the actual condition of the "man behind the plough." In his remarkable book, *The Bengal Peasantry*, Dutt wrote about the plight of the peasants under the Permanent Settlement in Bengal: "Zamindars still possess to an indefinite extent the power to oppress, harass and ruin their ryots in a variety of ways against which the law affords no redress." In *The Economic History of India in the Victorian Age*, Dutt quoted long extracts from the Dufferin Enquiry Committee's Report (1888) to focuss attention on the poverty and helplessness of the agricultural labour that had grown as a distinct social group among the peasants. It is not clear why Dutt left out the rent-paying share-croppers. Dutt did not fail to note that the discontent of the peasants flared up in the agrarian disturbances of 1875; he sought the cause of these disturbances in the enhancement of revenue. Although Dutt fought with almost missionary zeal against land-tax, he emphatically

asserted that the Permanent Settlement proved to be a boon to Bengali peasants. Here is a relevant extract from Dutt's *Economic History*, vol. I: "There may be some doubt as to the wisdom of Pitt's Permanent Settlement of the land-tax in England; there can be no doubt as to that of Cornwallis's Permanent Settlement in Bengal. In England the settlement benefited the landed classes only; in Bengal the settlement has benefited the whole agricultural community; the entire peasant population shares the benefit, and is more prosperous and resourceful on account of this measure.... In England it precluded the State from drawing a larger land-tax to be spent in the country for the benefit of the nation; in Bengal it has precluded the State from increasing the annual Economic Drain of wealth out of the country." It seems that Dutt shared the expectations of Cornwallis that were never fulfilled.

Secondly, Dutt noted the colonial type of economy fostered by the ruling class: "The production of raw material in India for British industries, and the consumption of British manufactures in India were the two-fold objects of the early commercial policy of England.... During a century and a half the commercial policy of the British rulers of India has been determined not by the interests of Indian manufacturers but by those of British manufacturers." Dutt returned to this theme in the discussion of the tariff policy and the notorious Excise duty. While welcoming the investment of British capital in India Dutt sharply attacked the main motivation of the ruling class: "British statesmen view things through a false perspective when the interests of British capitalists in India loom larger in their eyes than the interests of agriculture, and of those humbler industries on which the Indian nation, as a nation, depends for its existence." Dutt suggested that the Government "should cease to act under mandates from Manchester"; the Excise duty should be repealed; and a policy of protection should be adopted. It is familiar that these suggestions became the economic platform of the nationalist movement.

Thirdly, Dutt took a grim view of Indian finance, and particularly attacked the Home Charges and military expenditure. His panacea was retrenchment finance, and he directed his criticism against "unwise extravagance" in regard to railway building, and emphatically objected to "the further extension" of state railways or of guaranteed railways, and raised the irrigation *versus* railway controversy. Here are some of Dutt's suggestions: "Above all, the national expenditure of India should be retrenched. The military expenditure should be limited to India's requirements.... The Indian debt should be steadily reduced.... And the Home Charges, the annual expenditure of 17 millions of Indian money in London, should be steadily reduced."

Fourthly, Dutt called attention to the "Economic Drain" in the context of the poverty of the Indian people. It may be noted that the "Drain" theory was first formulated by Burke in the celebrated *Ninth*

Report (1783). Evidently Dutt was influenced by Burke and the Whig school. It seems that Dutt did not pay much attention, as Dadabhai Naoroji did, to "unrequited exports." It is not clear whether Dutt was familiar with Dadabhai's estimate of the drain at between £20 million and £30 million per year. In explaining the "Drain", Dutt quoted the views of Shore, Sullivan, Malcolm and Wingate. Dutt's main contention seems to be that surplus revenue was "not saved in India, nor devoted to irrigation or other works of improvement." It went "as a continuous tribute to England to pay dividends to the company's shareholders." When the rule of the Company ended the Government created the Public Debt; the Home charges rose to £17 million in 1900. This amount was annually remitted out of the country. An additional sum of "several millions" went out in the form of private remittances by European officers. Dutt argued that taxes raised in India were being remitted out of it and "lost to the country for ever." "It is this annual Economic Drain," Dutt wrote, "which impoverishes the Indian population more than any other cause."

In his introduction to Dutt's *Economic History* Dr. Gadgil points out a major gap in Dutt's analysis: "Dutt does not appear to pay much attention to the positive aspects of State policy and action. Indeed, his insistent complaints about high taxation and the level of government expenditure would indicate a preference for a lessening of government activity and outlay!"[5] In the light of modern economic thought some of Dutt's views would indeed appear to be conservative. Dutt seems to have failed to notice the possibilities inherent in Government activity in accelerating India's economic growth.

While emphasizing the negative aspects of the British rule in India Dutt did not pay sufficient attention to the importance of public expenditure in stimulating economic development. The fact cannot be denied that, whatever the pressures or pulls behind, there was an appreciable increase in public expenditure on development work in the second half of the nineteenth century. It may be argued that development work was mainly dictated by the commercial and strategic needs of the ruling power. Yet it unleashed new forces in economic life, the full effects of which came to be evident as time went on. It is true that India's economic growth remained sluggish. But the remedy was not retrenchment finance, but increased public expenditure on development work.

Dutt's criticism of railway building was also unreal. The railways released the latent potentialities of India for industrial advance. The coal industry could grow and expand because of the railways; the development of the engineering industry in the initial period was geared to the needs of the railways. Railway building generated domestic income and employment. The railway workshops came to be founded in the wake of railway construction, and some of these workshops grew to a substantial size and

gave employment to thousands of workers. Indeed the railway system proved to be, as Marx anticipated in 1853, "the forerunner of modern industry" in India.

Romesh Dutt rightly focussed attention on the ruin of India's handicrafts and the increasing pressure on land. Yet the historical fact cannot be denied that modern industry developed in India under British rule and laid the basis of future advance. The crucial significance of railway building has to be understood in this context. It seems Dutt had a tendency to idealize pre-capitalist mode of production, and fondly hoped that India's handicrafts would survive the onslaughts of capitalism. Dutt wrote in *The Economic History of India in the Victorian Age*:

"...the various industries of the country were carried on by humble artisans in their own villages and huts; the idea of large factories, owned by capitalists and worked by paid operatives, was foreign to the Indian mind. And despite the great results which are achieved by capital, it is nevertheless true that the individual man is at his best—in dignity and intelligence, in foresight and independence—when he works in his own fields or at his own loom, rather than when he is a paid labourer under a big landlord or a wage-earner in a huge factory. And every true Indian hopes that the small cultivation of India will not be replaced by landlordism, and that something of the home industries will survive the assaults of capitalism."

In addition to "Ancient History" and "Epics" and "Economic History," we have the articles written for the Bengali press.[6] The range of interest revealed in these articles is truly impressive. There are stimulating discussions on Mukundaram, Bharatchandra and Kalidas, on Bankim Chandra and Vidyasagar, on the gods in Rig Veda, on famines in India, on land tax. It seems that Dutt attached much importance to social history and relied on literary evidence to depict social life and institutions.

Perhaps the most brilliant of these essays are the historical writings which reveal Dutt's views on history. I would like to refer in particular to two essays: "Bankim Chandra O Adhunik Bangiya Sahitya" (Bankimchandra and Modern Bengali Literature), and "Unnatir Yug" (Age of Progress).[7] In a remarkable passage Dutt tried to assess the role of individual in history: "Those who say that these great men are free from the influences of their times and are strong in their own strength, they are wrong. Socrates was wise not only because of his own wisdom, in him were reflected the remarkable powers of thinking of the Greeks. Luther did not change Christianity with his own efforts. As a result of the growth of enlightenment in Europe the prevailing religious rites and practices appeared to be intolerable to the newly-emerging powerful nations of Europe. As their mouth-piece Luther destroyed these practices. Napoleon did not bring changes in the world by his powers alone, his strength flowed

from the limitless power released by the French Revolution, and Napoleon was able to demonstrate to the world his astonishing and unparalleled strength." (*translation mine*)

In the second article Dutt expressed his deep faith in the idea of progress and evolution. Surely he knew that progress did not advance in a straight line without breaks or reverses. Dutt knew that in man's march to progress there were periods of decay as well as those of progress. But he firmly held that human civilization was moving not towards decay but towards progress. Indeed, the very caption of this article, "Age of Progress," is significant. "Over the centuries, over the years," Dutt wrote, "man is moving gradually towards progress. It seems that the result of this progress becomes manifest once in five or seven centuries." In this article one comes across penetrating comments on the river valley civilizations, on the Vedic civilization and Greek civilization, on the age of Buddha and Confucius, Socrates, and Plato and Aristotle, and on the Roman civilization. There is a rapid survey of the progress of civilization from the age of Kalidas and Justinian to the age of Voltaire and Rousseau and the French Revolution; the emphasis is on progress and man's search for new values. In Dutt's opinion the study of these periods of progress enables the reader to comprehend "man's real history." Without social history, political history is barren, dull and unintelligible. In fact, history was conceived by Dutt as a record of man's progress towards liberty: "The Greeks achieved independence, Garibaldi liberated Italy, Bismarck unified Germany; liberty of man began to be proclaimed in the entire world." (*translation mine*)

This faith in the idea of progress is the hallmark of a great historian who, unlike the pessimist and the sceptic, finds some meaning in history.

REFERENCES

1. This biographical sketch is based mainly on an article published in the *Bengale* (edited by Surendranath Banerjee) on December 1, 1909; it is possible that Surendranath himself wrote this obituary. Also see J. C. Bagal's introduction to *Ramesh Rachanabali*, Sahitya Sansad, 1960; and J. N. Gupta, *Life and Work of Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E.*, 1911. J. C. Bagal inaccurately states that Benares Industrial Conference was an adjunct of the Congress session; in fact, the Indian Industrial Conference was founded in 1905. See the present writer's *Studies in Industrial Policy and Development of India, 1858-1914*, p. 133.
2. R. C. Dutt, *The Literature of Bengal* (1877).
3. Nivedita's article in *Modern Review*, Jan. 1910. Sister Nivedita had great admiration for Dutt whom she called her "God-father."

4. Dutt's letter to B. Gupta quoted in J. N. Gupta, *op. cit.*, p. 307.
5. D. R. Gadgil's introduction to *The Economic History of India*, vol. I (Govt. of India, 1959).
6. See Nikhil Sen, *Romesh Chandra Dutta, Prabandha Sankalan*, Calcutta, 1959. The present writer is indebted to Shri Sen who has compiled Dutt's essays published in Bengali journals: *Bharati, Hindu Darsan, Bhandar, Sadhana, Nabya Bharat, Mukul.* The book opens with Dutt's memoirs which deal with his early life. Shri Sen also gives a list of books and articles written by Dutt.
7. Nikhil Sen, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-10, 53-57.

SARDAR K. M. PANIKKAR

DR. TARASANKAR BANERJEE

(Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan)

MUSSOLINI once said, "I am not a man but an event." Kavalam Madhava Panikkar also was not only a great colourful personality, but an event in the realm of historical writing in modern India. A man with manifold interests—ranging from a flair for writing novels to the assiduous task of editing newspapers—Panikkar was born in Kavalam, Kerala (Malabar), in 1895. He received his education in Madras Christian College and in Christ Church, Oxford. In Oxford he obtained the coveted First Class in History and became a Dixon Scholar. After being called to the Bar (Middle Temple) he came back to India. When he joined the Aligarh Muslim University in 1919, it seemed that like many a brilliant student he would embrace teaching as his permanent career. But the secrets of his fate were yet to be unveiled. His teaching career ended in 1922, though he was somewhat attracted by Sir Ashutosh Mukherjee's offer of Readership in History in Calcutta University.

As soon as the *Hindustan Times* was launched in Delhi in 1924, Panikkar did not hesitate to accept the offer of its editorship. Journalism, however, could not quench his insatiable inquisitiveness. He left that career only to enter the services of the Indian Princely States and became the Secretary to the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes. From 1936 to 1939 he was the Foreign Minister of the Patiala State. In 1939 he entered the services of the Bikaner State and acted up to 1944 as the Foreign Minister. In 1944 he was elevated to the post of the Prime Minister of Bikaner, only to leave that post when the country became independent. It was in Bikaner that he received the Rajput title of 'Sardar'. Meanwhile, he acquired much experience of the Indian problem when he became the Secretary to the Indian States' delegation to the Round Table Conference between 1930 and 1933. In the Pacific Relations Conference in Canada in 1942, Panikkar acted as the representative of the Indian States.

In Independent India, Panikkar came forward to serve the country at the call of Pandit Nehru, and changed over to a politico-diplomatic career. This intrepid scholar-journalist-administrator became the main hinge of the emerging Indian diplomacy. Pandit Nehru utilised Panikkar's rich experience in evolving a pattern of Indian diplomacy. From 1948 to 1959 he held various diplomatic posts in different parts of the world and was the chief architect of the friendship between India and the People's Republic of China. At the end of his diplomatic and political career he

returned to the educational world to become the Vice-Chancellor of the Jammu and Kashmir University in 1961. It was like the completion of a life cycle. He started off in life in a university and died as the Vice -Chancellor of Mysore University on 11 December 1963.

It is remarkable that notwithstanding his peregrinations into diverse fields of activity, Panikkar remained essentially a scholar. He blended his varied experience with vast scholarship to make his "hobby of writing history"[1] immensely productive. Judged from the nature and extent of his output, it must be said that writing history was his passion and not merely "hobby". A review of his works will show that he strode along the huge span of Indian history like a colossus but with imagination and insight.

While at Aligarh, Panikkar wrote *Sri Harsha of Kanauj—A Monograph on the History of India in the first half of the 7th century A.D.* (1922). Much has been written about Harsha since 1922, but at that time this monograph admirably fulfilled the needs of the students. In chapter I he analysed the political condition of India just on the eve of Harsha's accession to the throne. As Panikkar writes, "there can be no doubt that though Harsha's Government was personal in one sense the royal authority was by no means despotic" (chapter III). Towards the end of his reign, he followed a pacific policy notwithstanding a large and fully equipped army. This was due to the influence of Buddhism on Harsha. While analysing the social condition of the time, Panikkar observed a great revival of Sanskrit and the re-assertion of Brahmanical religion (chapter IV). But Panikkar's opinion that "as Brahminism had no organised church, its influence was less obvious and perhaps less felt" (p. 39) may be contradicted. When Panikkar asserted that "Harsha was without doubt an enlightened monarch and deserves to be considered among India's greatest rulers" (p. 37), it seems that Harsha captured his imagination. His comparison of Harsha with Akbar cannot be considered seriously. Written in a lucid style, the monograph is easy and popular reading.

Panikkar's deep interest in ancient Indian history was also reflected in the *Origin and Evolution of Kingship in India* (1938), the published form of the series of lectures he delivered at the invitation of the Baroda state. The main object of this study was to dispel the idea among European Orientalists that "politics did not form a subject of serious study among the Hindus; that the fundamental questions of political organisation, such as the theory of sovereignty, the principle of obedience, the structure of the state and society were not the subject of enquiry by a people presumed to have been steeped in metaphysical speculation" (Introductory). He traced the origin and evolution of kingship in India from the time of the Vedas to the end of the Hindu period. Notwithstanding various theories about the origin and evolution of kingship in Hindu India, the fact remains

that no divine origin could be attributed, with justice, to the kings by Hindu political theorists (p. 42). There was no magical origin either. While discussing the duties of the king, Panikkar observed that the Hindu kingship never developed into an autocracy which was so common in Europe (p. 105).

Malabar and the Portuguese, etc. and *Malabar and the Dutch* (1931) are two complementary works of Panikkar which trace the history of European connection with the West Coast of India from the beginning of the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth century. Studying the Portuguese contact with Malabar, he came to the conclusion that the Portuguese political organisation was totally ineffective. Their authority extended over Goa and a few other coastal towns, in spite of the fact that they had dreamt of carving out a kingdom of their own. Even from the point of view of trade, their connection did not ultimately prove to be highly remunerative as the monopoly of trade which they claimed was not conceded by the Indian powers in this region. They were soon eclipsed by the Dutch who gave them a death blow after the capture of Cochin in 1663. The Dutch flare blazed with full fury for more than a century and then faded out only to make room for the English.

The first connection of the Dutch with Malabar began in 1604, when the Zamorin of Calicut entered into a treaty with Admiral Haghen. Quilon and Cranganore were captured in 1661, and Cochin fell into the Dutch hands in 1663. Though the Dutch stepped into the shoes of the Portuguese, Panikkar asserted that they never became the Paramount Power in Malabar (p. 117). Their political authority extended over Cochin and Quilon mainly. The Dutch power ultimately disappeared as a sequel to their alliance with the French in Europe during the Napoleonic wars. Cochin was captured by the English in 1795 and "with this the Dutch flag ceased to fly on the Malabar coast" (p. 111).

Panikkar rightly considered that the Dutch connection with Malabar was in many ways beneficial. The book is well written no doubt, but the footnoting is so unsatisfactory that it raises doubts in the minds of specialists that Panikkar did not study the Dutch sources carefully. But in the introduction he stated that he had gone through thirty-six volumes of translated Dutch records in the India Office, London, and admitted that "owing to the shortness of my stay in Holland I was not able to make full use of these [records]" (p. xx).

True to the spirit of the time Panikkar was attracted by the problems of Indian education at the early stage of his career, and wrote *Essays on Educational Reconstruction in India* in 1920. Three essays of this volume were prepared while he was in Oxford. The book was written at a time when Indian opinion with regard to educational problems was taking shape vigorously. Panikkar noted that "the conviction has gained ground that the present system of education in India is thoroughly ineffective and

does not in any way help in the great programme of reconstruction before us" (p. 3). As the social ideals of the English education were entirely different from and, to a great extent, hostile to the Indian condition, he pleaded for the system of national education (Essay 1). In that system there would be no attempt at "maintaining status relations" (p. 17). It is apparent that Panikkar used the expression 'national education' in a wider sense of the term, and observed that it was interpreted differently by moderate and extremist nationalists. He had no hesitation to express that in a true Indian system English can never serve the purpose of a medium of instruction (p. 38). He summarily rejected the claims of all other Indian languages, especially Tamil and Bengali which, however cultivated their literatures might be, could not claim to be anything but "a language spoken by a sub-nationality" (p. 40). He, therefore, pleaded for "Hindusthani" as a common language. It is not, however, clear whether he wanted to substitute English by Hindusthani in all stages of a national educational system. The proper education of women and children was then urged by Panikkar (pp. 43 and 127). What he dreaded most was perhaps the officialisation of education which he viewed as an antithesis to the rise of Indian nationalism. "The nationalist movement in India," he wrote, "is threatened today by a grave danger, that of an inquisitorial control by the state of the educational machinery" (p. 50). He urged the reform of Indian universities in consonance with the needs of the time. Panikkar suffered from a contradiction when, instead of advocating a broad-based liberal education, he suggested the institution of "separate courses where the candidates should be given the training and education which would fit them for their work in government offices" (p. 100). He was frankly in favour of maintaining the "bread-ticket" system in a different form. He was against the "standardisation of intelligence" (p. 128). In this volume it is apparent that instead of a scholarly exposition of the problems of Indian education, he adumbrated his own philosophy of education.

The works that gave wider recognition to Panikkar related to the study of the relations between the Indian Princely States and the Government of India. It is one of the fields in which Panikkar could speak from his own experience with authority. Sir Ashutosh Mukherjee invited him to deliver the Calcutta University Readership Lectures on the evolution of British policy towards the Indian States during the period 1774-1858. The outcome of his study was a comprehensive volume published in July, 1927 which was revised and enlarged by him in December, 1932 with the title *Indian States and the Government of India*. The purpose of this work was not, as he himself stated in the Introduction, "to justify the existence of Indian States or to attack their methods of government." The main object was "to analyse and interpret the unique system of polity"

that had developed in India "partly as a result of policy and partly as a result of historical accident" (p. ix). Unlike Lee-Warner whose sole object was to justify the imperialist standpoint, Panikkar wanted to tackle the problem with a spirit of independence and impartiality—as he asserted in the Preface—in spite of his intimate connections with the Princely States. He, however, admitted that two things made the study difficult: (i) the vagueness of the term 'Indian States' and (ii) the absence of any regular sources of information, because "the Government of India has always treated the subject as a sacred mystery" (p. xiii). From the early days (chapter I) he traced the evolution of the States and the British policy towards them. During the period from Lord Hastings to the Mutiny (chapter II) the aggrandisement of the States was the main object. "The short-sightedness of the policy pursued towards the States between 1813-55 became clear in the blazing light of the conflagration of 1857" (p. 25). Hence a rethinking after 1857 (chapter III). Though the old policy of jealousy and annexation was rejected, the position of the States underwent a silent revolution. "From the foreign and independent allies of a sovereign corporation, the great States found themselves transferred to the protection of the Crown of England, whose authority over them was boldly and frankly announced" (p. 26). With the growth of a central power Imperial authority was gradually extended and asserted (chapters IV and VI). The working of the paramountcy (chapter V) revealed that there had been "a clear and undeniable restriction of the rights of Indian States" (p. 99). Intervention in the internal affairs of the States had become a normal practice though on many an occasion it triggered off controversy and ill-feeling (chapter VII). The administrative expansion and economic penetration by the British Indian authorities further eroded the rights of the States. The new tendency was to consider India as a single unit. In spite of this Panikkar considered that "within the limits set by the agreements that define their relation with the British Government, Indian rulers are sovereigns by every criterion of political science" (p. 145). But what was actually found was that practice differed from preaching and theories did not tally with facts. The constitutional position was rather complicated (chapter IX). The accepted view was that the States were under "the suzerainty of the Crown" and Panikkar also noted that "this view has even found statutory expression" (p. 149). He contradicted his earlier statement that "Indian rulers are sovereigns by every criterion" when he wrote that "even as regards the British Empire, India, both British and Indian, is a single entity" (p. 149). Panikkar viewed the institution of the Chamber of Princes (chapter XII) as "the surrender of one of the most cherished principles of British policy in relation to the Indian States, viz., the refusal to permit joint action or interest in each other's affairs" (p. 152). True, it was a subtle but important change. The semblance of sovereignty was seen when "the Indian delegation to the Imperial

Conference always included a ruling Prince as representative of the independent States of India" (p. 157). But what Panikkar did not realise or perhaps was not ready to admit was that co-operation with British imperialism lay at the bottom of the concession. In this connexion Mahatma Gandhi's observation is significant. He said that gradually the Princes became "British officers in Indian dress."

The legal aspects of the problems of the Princely States were discussed by Panikkar in another volume entitled *Inter-Statal Law—The Law affecting the relations of the Indian States with the British Crown.* This is the published form of six lectures (Sundaram Ayyar–Krishnaswami Ayyar Lectures) delivered by him in Madras University in 1933-34. These lectures are highly technical but complementary to his earlier study of the States. Sir William Lee-Warner's work was essentially political and did not devote much attention to the problems of interstatal law. In his *The Native States of India* Lee-Warner presented the British point of view. But Panikkar's object was to fill in the gap and approach the problem from the point of view of the States. He differed with Lee-Warner with regard to the concept of "paramountcy." To Panikkar it was "merely the expression denoting the position in which an Indian State stands to the Crown" and could not be "a source of law" (p. 13). The territorial extent of the States was definitely fixed and Princes could not add to it by conquest and other processes known to International Law (p. 21). But Panikkar had to agree with Westlake that the Indian States had no international personality. "The Indian States," he wrote, "in virtue of the delegation of their external independence and the right of self-defence have no international life" (p. 31). Moreover, on a careful analysis of the law relating to sovereignty (lecture II) he had to concede that the Paramount Power had the right to intervene in the affairs of a State if gross misgovernment prevailed there. The law relating to jurisdiction made the problem more complicated (lecture IV). Though the subjects of the Indian States were not British subjects in the strict sense of the term, there was no law defining nationality in the States (p. 67). All these show that the Indian States were firmly tied to the chariot wheel of British imperialism to ensure the system of indirect rule over the non-British area.

Panikkar summed up his views on the *Indian States* again in 1942 in a pamphlet (no. 4) of the series "Oxford Pamphlets on Indian Affairs." This pamphlet proves that he did not change his stand vis-à-vis the relation of the States with the Government of India. His analysis of the problem was as thorough as that of Lee-Warner. Both of them were penetrating in their own ways. Panikkar may be said to be the Indian Lee-Warner minus the imperialist bias. Lee-Warner's position is clear. He wanted to defend the imperialist standpoint. But Panikkar's case is rather confusing. Definitely, he did not represent the nationalist views. To put on impartiality

he made his position self-contradictory in many points. If rights and duties of the States were sacred, there could not be any ground for co-operation with British imperialism. It is disappointing that he did not see, or perhaps did not want to admit, that co-operation with imperialism went against the larger interests of the country, though it brought certain advantages to the Princes themselves. He, however, wrote, "with changed circumstances the British authorities themselves began to feel that co-operation with the Princes as a body may bear fruitful results" (*Inter-Statal Law*, p. 109). It is really astonishing that a man of the stature of Panikkar could not visualise even in 1942 when India was struggling for independence, that the numerous fragmented States would be an anachronism in New India. Even after noting the political, economic and geographical unity of India as a whole, he could not see the writing on the wall. He still upheld the exclusiveness of the small units in the Indian body politic. In the concluding portion of the *Oxford Pamphlets* he lamented that "the value of political units of convenient size is easily forgotten in a world impressed by immensity." In his opinion, the small States fulfilled a function which was of "immense value to the diversified life of the motherland." Perhaps his deep involvement in the affairs of the Princely States stood in the way of his prescribing the melting of the small units in the future crucible of nationalist India. But we should not blame him for being a historian in the strict sense of the term, who is expected to analyse what it is and not what it ought to be.

Panikkar's intimate connection with the Indian Princes attracted his attention to the study of the life and activities of some of them. Hence we find him writing a biographical study of *Gulab Singh* in 1930. A new edition of the book came out in 1953 with the title *The Founding of the Kashmir State: A Biography of Maharaja Gulab Singh*. It must be noted that it is one of the main texts which has been referred to for the justification of the frontier rights of Kashmir in Ladakh and Aksai Chin. The greatness of Gulab Singh should be assessed with reference to the fact that the hilly tract between the plains of the Punjab and the valley of Kashmir was never before his time united under any single ruler. Born in 1792, Gulab Singh showed in his early days that he was a child of destiny. At the age of seventeen he came to the Sikh Court of Lahore as an adventurer, but very soon attracted the attention of the great Sikh ruler Ranjit Singh. Thereafter his rise was phenomenal. Almost within six years of his accepting service under Ranjit Singh he had become an important grandee (chapter II, p. 26). In all the campaigns of Ranjit Singh he played a prominent part. But as Panikkar's study reveals, Gulab had always "dreamt of uniting all the hilly country over which his ancestors ruled into One State" (p. 24). The dream of Gulab Singh was realised in 1822 when he was rewarded with a grant from Ranjit Singh of the principality of Jammu with the hereditary title of Rajah. Ranjit Singh himself installed Gulab

on the *Gaddi* and personally performed the *Raj Tilak*. Between 1822 and 1839 he made further conquests in the hilly tracts lying in the interior of Jammu.

After the death of Ranjit Singh, Gulab became a powerful figure in the north-eastern region. The anarchy in the Sikh state drew him from Lahore to his own dominions (chapter III). It was at this time that he made friendship with Henry Lawrence. On the eve of the Anglo-Sikh War he earned the displeasure of Rani Jhindan who made every effort to root out the Jammu family (chapter IV). Meanwhile, he had gathered further strength by his conquest of Ladakh, Baltistan and Western Tibet between 1834 and 1842. Gulab's tact paid him rich dividends, and seven days after the Treaty of Lahore (16 March 1846), Kashmir was sold out to him by the English as Henry Lawrence realised the necessity of conciliating him. He was also recognised as an independent sovereign. Panikkar rightly remarked that Gulab was "undoubtedly an opportunist, ready to stand out boldly or to withdraw as the occasion demanded" (p. 152). When Gulab Singh died in 1858, he left behind him a strong integrated and peaceful state which was, perhaps, destined to play a crucial role in the politics of the Indian sub-continent.

Another well written volume came out in 1936, entitled *The Indian Prince in Council—A Record of the Chancellorship of His Highness The Maharaja of Patiala*. Panikkar's relation with the Maharaja is too well known and it is but natural that he would give us an authentic account. For nearly ten years the Maharaja was the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes which, according to Panikkar, was instituted "as the result of the desire of the rulers of the Indian States for an organization which would enable the Viceroy and the Princes to come together and to deliberate on matters relating to the Empire, India and the States as a whole" (p. v). The British rulers appreciated very well the value of the co-operation of the Princes, especially at a time when the nationalist movement was assuming a menacing character from the point of view of British imperialism. The Maharaja was a member of the Standing Committee of the Chamber which was formally inaugurated in February, 1921. In 1926 the Maharaja became its Chancellor.

Panikkar noted with satisfaction that the Maharaja's Chancellorship also "marked an epoch in the relationship of the Paramount Power with the so-called smaller States" whose rulers were excluded from the Chamber of Princes (chapter V, p. 51). This is one of the reasons why the Maharaja demanded a larger Upper House in the Federal Legislature in which even the small States could get representation (p. 68). When the question of Dominion Status was being seriously discussed, he did not conceal "his conviction that India is entitled to the largest measure of self-government consistent with her position in the Empire" (p. 78); Panikkar concluded that the Chancellorship of the Maharaja of Patiala "will stand out in

modern Indian history as a period of great achievement" (p. 128). The utterly uncritical nature of the work cannot escape the notice of a serious reader. We are constrained to say that the Sardar did not care to put the achievement of the Maharaja to the acid test of critical evaluation in the light of nationalist opinions. The view that "Panikkar chose to write of them as administrators of segments of India as it existed and to depict them as men who had built up indigenous traditions of indirect rule in India"[3] perhaps does not express the whole truth. What we get in this volume is a journalist's image of a Prince whom he admired.

It is interesting that only a couple of years before he entered the services of the Bikaner State he wrote *His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner: A Biography* (1937). Ganga Singhji's rule constituted an important chapter in the history of the Bikaner State as well as in the history of modern India. While fully alive to his responsibility of maintaining a good government in his state, the Maharaja was, however, "in no way prepared to tolerate the daily naggings of interfering political agents." He was left free to work out the future of Bikaner according to his own light, and his success earned the pleasure of Lord Minto. Panikkar noted that the work of Ganga Singhji as Chancellor was "one of careful consolidation" (p. 247). Meanwhile, he carried out further internal reforms and the greatest testimony to his zeal was the Ganga canal which transformed a portion of the vast and sandy expanse of Bikaner into a smiling field. It is true that though he was one of the staunchest champions of the States and was not liked by nationalist leaders, the people of Bikaner were proud of their ruler and were not slow to appreciate his work. Panikkar was, perhaps, caught in the web of the same sentiment. There is no doubt that he has given us a well-written and thorough narrative. If a biographical study is to be classed as history, an expectant reader will be badly disappointed in not getting any real assessment of the work and policy of Ganga Singhji in the light of contemporary nationalist developments. But, as a popular biographical work, its value still remains.

Interested as he was in the affairs of the Princely States, Panikkar also studied the constitutional problems of India as he foresaw a transfer of power from British to Indian hands. His ideas about the future framework of Indian constitution were expressed in the *Federal India* (1930) which he wrote in collaboration with Col. K. N. Haksar. He held that "the problem of the attainment of political freedom by India is not free from complexities" (Preface). India had peculiar problems of her own which could not be overlooked at the time of prescribing a constitutional set-up. Panikkar expressed the opinion that the history of India from the earliest times showed "a remarkable persistence of regional particularism" and an "interplay of centripetal and centrifugal forces". The main problem of the constitution of India, therefore, was "to provide a stable equilibrium for its centripetal and centrifugal forces" (chapter I). He analysed

the conditions of various states and showed that a similar situation existed in India also, justifying his proposition. He noted that the federal solution of India's problems was being discussed purely from "the point of view of the political organization of British India." But he firmly expressed the view that to leave the Indian States as "Foreign" would be to evade the crux of the problem. What Panikkar prescribed was a federation of British India with the Indian States with juridical, institutional and legal guarantees (chapters V, VI and VII). He further stated, "if the Federal Executive is made responsible to a body elected on a *non-federal and unitary* basis, then the guarantees provided for the states will become illusory" (p. 120); and that the "practical result would be a camouflaged annexation of the Indian States" (p. 121). His solution was: "British India would enjoy responsible government for purposes of its exclusive affairs, and for purposes of All India affairs, by alliance with the states, a Dominion would come into being, the central authority of which would be created by agreement" (p. 122). But the study is important in the sense that it presented the other point of view—the approach of the Princes towards the constitutional problems of India.

Panikkar's ideas about constitutional problems, pure and simple, had already been reflected in 1928 in *The Working of Dyarchy in India, 1919-28*, written under the pseudonym 'Kerala Putra'. As he stated in the introduction, his object was solely to analyse the Montagu-Chelmsford constitution and to see how far it had been successful as a first instalment of Responsible Government in India. He first examined the government of India before the Act of 1919 (chapter I), and rightly observed that "the war had quickened the democratic impulse in India" (p. 9). British statesmen recognised that a clear and definite statement of British policy towards India had become imperative. Hence the Declaration of 20 August, 1917. "It should not, however, be forgotten," Panikkar wrote, "that though the principle of responsibility was introduced and a measure of Indianisation was decided upon, the autocratic character of the Government was still maintained" (p. 25). It is, however, difficult to accept his proposition that "but for the political circumstances...the working of the Reforms would perhaps have yielded more satisfactory results" (p. 27).

About the "Dyarchy in the Provinces" (chapter IV) Panikkar remarked that so far as ministerial responsibility was concerned, the whole scheme was defeated. The Rules made by the Government of India and the Governors were an antithesis to the proper working of the system. Moreover, "there was never an opportunity for the development of a grouping based on opposition or support to the Government in the Councils" (chapter V, p. 70). In the financial sphere the position was worse (chapter VI). The only silver lining was "the close contact between the people and their representatives in the councils, and as a result far-reaching social legislation was attempted in some provinces (chapter VIII). About the future

set-up (chapter IX), he ruled out the development of a constitution on a purely Indian basis. Panikkar held the view that the future constitution of India should be framed only on the basis of "responsible Government in the English sense," and wanted to prescribe a model which was to be kept in view by the Simon Commission in deciding the future constitution for India.

On the eve of Independence Panikkar wrote a pamphlet, *The Basis of An Indo-British Treaty* (1946), in which he related the future relationship between the two countries to the defence problems of the Indian Ocean region. In the words of Panikkar, in her own interest "India has the last chance for fulfilling her national destiny as a partner in the maritime State System" (p. 5). As a maritime power, India can succeed only when she is industrially strong, and it is really heartening to find that he asserted that "the liquidation of British vested interests in India should be an article of the treaty" (p. 7) between India and England. The objects of the proposed Treaty also included the maintenance of scientific research, creation of wide-spread industrial and technical efficiency (p. 9), etc. Panikkar believed that in the interest of both the countries there should be a political and military treaty (p. 11) which could be smoothly worked by devising a suitable machinery. He went a step further and said, "the Indo-British treaty, in the wider aspects of its organization, can, therefore, justifiably be considered as a part of the world security system" (p. 16). The pamphlet also reveals that Panikkar upheld the later nineteenth century tradition of looking to England with great expectation that she would have a genuine interest in the welfare of India, irrespective of the imperialistic needs. This conformity with the old tradition proved that Panikkar was extremely moderate in his attitude towards England in relation to India.

In studying Indian history Panikkar's canvas is really vast. One of his interests, which has been somewhat overlooked by Indian historians in general, is his study of geo politics. The influence of the same was reflected in his *India and the Indian Ocean—An Essay on the Influence of Sea Power on Indian History*, published in 1945. In this work, however, he transcended the limits of simple geo-politics and assumed the role of a strategical thinker. The fundamental proposition of Panikkar in this volume was that "India never lost her independence till she lost the command of the sea in the first decade of the sixteenth century" (Introduction). He wanted to trace "the influence of Indian Ocean on the shaping of Indian history and to discuss the vital importance of oceanic control to the future of India." The oceans around India had become "an active thoroughfare of commercial and cultural traffic" (p. 23) since time immemorial (chapter I). The naval activity in the Hindu period is well known and "the idea that the Hindus had some kind of a ceremonial

objection to the sea, while perhaps true in respect of the people of North India, was never true in respect of the people of the South" (chapter II, p. 29). A new element was introduced with the coming of the Europeans (chapter III). Panikkar rightly observed that "without a decisive battle, the supremacy of the sea passed to the Portuguese" (p. 43). The commercial empire of the Portuguese backed by a strong sea-power declined with the decay of Portugal's political and naval power in Europe (chapter IV). A new struggle for a naval empire ensued between the Dutch, the French and the English (chapter V). The strategy of Albuquerque found its culmination in the British occupation of Malacca and Singapore. In the nineteenth century the Indian Ocean was virtually transformed into a British lake (chapter VI). This was facilitated by the opening of the Suez canal. In the present century "the entry of Japan into the Indian Ocean demonstrated clearly the entire dependence of the security of India on the mastery of the seas" (p. 81). This hard fact was demonstrated more vigorously during the Second World War. Panikkar rightly contended that the whole question of Indian defence must be considered both in the light of history and of recent events.

Panikkar could foresee that since the Indian Ocean came into the vortex of world politics, the naval powers of the U.S.A., Russia, Japan and, possibly, China would be locked into a contest for the control of the vast oceanic span around India. Panikkar became prophetic when he predicted that "the Indian Ocean will be one of the major problems of the future" (p. 91). He urged that first of all India must be converted into an industrially strong country which is essential for any scheme of regionalism. Secondly, he ruled out "an exclusively land policy of defence" and urged the building up of a naval strength which would be able to defend the long and open Indian coast-line. With the farsight of a military strategist Panikkar held that the active control of the ocean around India was possible only by having suitable island cover as advanced bases. In his opinion, with a ring of naval fortifications covering islands like Andamans, Nicobars, etc. the coast-line of India can be protected for the future, and the lines of communications on the sea, vital to Indian interests, secured firmly. The volume under review is one of the finest products of Sardar Panikkar. It is a testimony to the fact that sometimes a historian can rise above the bare objectivity of his study, visualise the future trend of problems facing a country and prescribe the necessary outlook towards the same. It is no wonder that the volume drew high praise from Captain Liddle Hart, a great military critic of this century, from Guy Wint and others.

Another geo-political study came out in 1955 under the title *Geographical Factors in Indian History*. Panikkar started with the thesis that "geography constitutes the permanent basis of every nation's history" and that "both the internal policies of a country and its external relations

are governed largely by the unalterable geographical conditions and their relationship in space to other countries" (Introduction). He remarked that "India's history can only be understood if we realise that it is a perpetual struggle to achieve a harmony between the Gangetic plain and the Deccan" (chapter II). The role of the Himalayas and the sea (chapters III and IV) in Indian life and politics can hardly be overemphasised. It was due to these barriers that India could maintain the continuity of her civilization in the face of foreign invasions through different routes (chapter V). The pressure of the nomads against civilization was an important factor in the history of early times. "Those countries," Panikkar aptly observed, "which stand directly in the way of these nomads are destroyed and broken up from time to time. Those that are protected by geography receive a backwash and after a turmoil settle down again" (p. 18).

What Panikkar wanted to emphasise was that harmony should be maintained between the Gangetic valley and the Deccan to mould an organised land mass and to develop the oceanic outlook to thwart the danger from sea. There cannot be any difference of opinion with regard to Panikkar's proposition that India needs "both a continental view and appreciation of sea power" (p. 120). The main importance of his work lies in the fact that it sets a guideline for the future policy-makers of India.

Apart from his study of specific problems of India's history, Panikkar brought out in 1947 a general analysis of the history of India from the earliest times to the present century under the title *A Survey of Indian History*. As he said in the Introduction (second edition, 1954), he was greatly moved by the remark of a Chinese scholar that a book on Indian History looked "less like a historical work than a telephone directory—an enumeration of names unconnected with each other." What he actually did in the volume was to give a connected story of known facts of Indian history in a superb style. He arranged the chapters in a masterly manner with a view to bringing out clearly and convincingly the main factors that gave a distinctive shape to India of the present times. Written in a lucid style, the volume will greatly appeal to general readers, both Indian and non-Indian. The popularity of the work is proved by the fact that it was reprinted twelve times between 1947 and 1962.

In December 1961 Panikkar delivered a course of three lectures under the Bharatiya Vidya-Bhavana Annual Birla Endowment Scheme on Indian History. These lectures were published in 1963 under the title *The Determining Periods of Indian History* in which he reviewed the course of Indian history from a new perspective. His main thesis is that "the basic fact in respect of Indian history is the continuity of the Hindu people since the time of their first integration..." (p. 3). To prove this he took an extensive sweep of three hundred years (350 to 250 B.C.—The

Integration of the Indian People; 1330 to 1430 A.D.—Resistance to Islam; and 1818 to 1918—Encounter with the West). These were the periods "when the Hindu people, who, it can never too strongly be emphasised, constitute the basis of Indian history and culture, overcame the dangers that challenged them and emerged strong enough to carry on their own life" (p. 4). The first period which gave India "the conception of unity and empire" witnessed "the integration of the Hindus into a community based on common religious beliefs" (p. 19). In the second this community was faced with a new danger. But in the confrontation with Islam ultimately the vitality of the old culture triumphed. It became clear that though Hinduism was, in fact, no more than the religion of a conquered people, India was "not destined to be a Muslim country." The issue raised in the third period, according to Panikkar, was "the confrontation of a superior, expanding and highly dynamic civilization with an old, static and, as it appeared, decaying culture" (p. 45). The result was the emergence of "a new civilization rooted firmly in India's own ancient traditions but adopting and assimilating many things from the civilization of the West" (p. 67). Panikkar, in his eagerness to prove indirectly the vitality of the Hindu culture, adopted a sectarian attitude and thereby identified himself to some extent with the revivalist group of thinkers.

Almost the same outlook was reflected in his *The Foundations of New India* (1963). Panikkar observed that "India today is the scene of a great experiment" (p. 253). A fundamental transformation is in the process, involving no less than the creation of a new civilization by conscious democratic means. It is definitely more than a process of modernization. He has analysed India's inheritance (Part I), the social structure (Part II), the intellectual setting (Part III), constitutional tradition and thinking (Part IV), and above all, the impact of the Mahatma and Marx (chapter V) to x'ray the profile of New India (Part VI) that is being built by Indian leaders since our Independence. "The birth of a new civilization, an attempted synthesis of the East and the West, a commingling of the two, producing a new way of life with a distinct individuality, this is what India today stands for" (p. 254). But the real question is whether the changes now taking place in India are durable. If this synthesis proves to be durable, then India will be the forerunner of a new movement. If it fails, in Panikkar's opinion, Asia, and not only India, will again fall back in the march of time. What is apparent is that he wants to assess the role of India in a wider perspective. It reflects, at the same time, the pet thesis that India occupies a pivotal position in Asia—an idea that is yet to come out of an acid test of history. Shortly before his death, Panikkar completed the manuscript of another book which was published in 1964 under the title *India—Past and Present*. It is a sort of handbook helpful for the foreigners who want to have a bird's-eye view of India's history, people and achievements.

Panikkar was not confined to the study of India's own internal history. He looked at it from a wider angle of vision and tried to realise India's history in relation to that of others. At the age of twenty-one he studied the problems of Indian emigration in a small volume entitled the *Problems of Greater India* (1916). The appalling condition of the Indian emigrants in different colonies of the British empire drew his attention and led him to think about a possible solution. Political, socio-economic and religious factors lay at the bottom of this emigration. He was pained to see that in all the countries where the Indians had settled permanently the 'white' population had invariably worked against the betterment of their condition (p. 31). In his opinion India must accept the responsibility to help them in securing economic advantages. Moreover, he suggested that India should see that Indians abroad got the benefits of Indian civilization. The problem had become acute because the emigrants were fast losing their Indian-ness. Panikkar believed that they were losing their Indian-ness because they were out of touch with the Hindu society (p. 97). Hence he urged that the Indian spirit should be reclaimed and the best way to do that would be to create a Hindu society in the colonies. But this he asserted on an erroneous supposition that the emigrants were all Hindus. It is not a mature analysis of a problem which was more complex in character than it appeared to be.

In 1943 came out *The Future of South-East Asia* which was re-published under the title *The Future of India and South-East Asia* (1945). In this work he discussed in broad outline post-war planning for the whole of South-East Asia, an area which was long known as 'Further India'. The book was written when the entire area was under Japanese control, and this fact necessitated a reappraisal of the problem that South-East Asia was to face in case of a "Bourbon restoration" there at the end of the war. The colonial system collapsed and the post-war policy in regard to the area had to be based on the freedom of colonial peoples. In his opinion, the future of the region depended on "the development of a non-colonial and balanced internal economy, and on a collective security in which all powers directly concerned share in responsibility." He analysed the roles of Burma, Thailand, Indo-China and other South-East Asian countries, and came to the conclusion that the problem of security in the region was essentially connected with the problem of freedom (p. 107). Here also he emphasised the role of India, and argued that a free and stable government in India was the essential prerequisite of the success of any future scheme for South-East Asia in general (p. 17).

A study of cultural relations between India and China is also necessary for the proper appreciation of the problem of South-East Asia, as the states in this area, by and large, represent the spirit of synthesis of the Indian and Chinese civilizations. The study of Sino-Indian relationship is, therefore, the object of Panikkar's *India and China* (1957). Intimate

religious, cultural and social relations existed between them for a period of nearly fifteen hundred years. Nobody can deny the contribution of this close association to the shaping of the Asian mind. The "confrontation" of these two civilizations in the past produced good results, and Panikkar hoped in 1957 that the confrontation between them in the modern age would produce a glorious and enduring impact. In the case of South -East Asia Panikkar noted that Communism would have a great impact and might give a differentiating turn to the traditional pattern. But, he overlooked this fact in the case of Indo-Chinese relationship, and, therefore, could not imagine that the new confrontation might produce dangerous consequences affecting the future of the whole of South-East Asia.

Panikkar's sensitive mind was also greatly concerned about the newly emerging states of Asia and Africa and hence he discussed their problems to find a way out. Thus we find *The Afro-Asian States and Their Problems* published in 1959. During the period between 1945 and 1957 a number of states in Asia and Africa became independent. These states were born at a time when the world was undergoing revolutionary changes in every sphere. The problems they faced were in many ways similar. They had to devise a suitable political organization for themselves. They had to provide an efficient administration for a modern government, and above all, they had to rebuild their exploited economy. Panikkar found that the most pressing problem in the political structure was the subordination of the army to the legislative and executive authority. This could be done if a proper democratic spirit was cultivated. He remarked, "If democratic institutions are only formal, or have become discredited with the people then the army becomes a rival centre of power" (p. 30). The problem of administration was no less serious. With the withdrawal of the ruling authority and of the superior personnel, the Civil Service became weak. To fill up that vacuum was the main task. "The future of the new states, therefore," Panikkar wrote, "to a very large extent depends on the rapidity with which they are able to build up a competent, trained and honest administration..." (p. 43). Perhaps the most complicated question was how to rebuild the economy, and he found that the only answer was to reconstruct a self-sustaining economy. Education, both general and scientific, could be overlooked only at the risk of stagnation and ruination of the entire structure. The most tricky problem was, however, to reorganise the social structure with a view to conforming to the political, economic and moral ideas of modern life. In the opinion of Panikkar, this problem must be viewed in terms of nationalism (p. 95). To achieve all this is a gigantic task no doubt. It is also true that the world situation has increased its complexity. But pessimism must be shunned, and a forward-looking attitude will provide a new strength to reach the goal.

Panikkar took the academic world by storm when his *Asia and Western Dominance* came out in 1953. It is one of his controversial but significant

contributions to the store-house of history. It also enabled the writer to reach the zenith of his publicity and fame. As such, it requires a careful consideration by the students of the history of Asia. It is actually a critical survey of the European contact with the Asian States between 1498 and 1945—a period which he describes as the Vasco da Gama epoch of Asian history. Panikkar started with two fundamental theses: (i) The control of the sea made it possible for the European nations to spread the tentacles of their economic and political influence over the Asian states; and (ii) there was a feeling of European solidarity as against the Asians. The European control of the Atlantic led to the mastery of the Indian Ocean and ultimately of the Pacific. In the words of Panikkar, the "blockade of Asia by the European sea powers is the first feature that gives the da Gama epoch its unity" (p. 13). Economic imperialism of the West was slowly transformed into a greed for territorial possessions (part II). In the "age of empire" (1858-1914) the European stranglehold was almost complete (part III). The imposition of a commercial economy on the people of Asia brought about a silent revolution in almost every aspect of Asian life which constituted the dominant feature of Europe's relations with Asia. In the nineteenth century, Europe, with its organised political, social and economic structure, challenged the basis of Asian societies. Happily, however, it was not without any reaction. Western contact with Asia had one bright aspect. A large-scale meeting of Asian and Western minds created a sort of mental ferment. The Asian countries awoke from a long, deep slumber so to say. In India, Japan and China it was the Western-educated intellectuals who assumed the leadership in the movement that ultimately displaced European supremacy. In a word, it may be said that the growth of nationalism in Asia was a reaction to the dominance of the West. Simultaneously, as Panikkar observed, Western unity gave rise to a sense of Asianism or a feeling of Asian solidarity. The rise of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. as World Powers and their increased influence in the affairs of Asia introduced a new element in Asian politics in the present century. In his opinion, "the development of Russian influence was in a sense parallel to the American movement" (p. 16). From the end of the first world war Europe was on the retreat from Asia. But the recovery of Asia (chapter VI) was possible, in his opinion, due to the vitality of the old religion and culture of different Asian countries. Hinduism in India, Shintoism in Japan or the Buddhist culture in China stood as a stumbling block and provided the vital force to resist Europeanization. The result was that the main object of the Christian missions in different countries of Asia failed (chapter VII). In Panikkar's view, the European attempt to Christianize Asia indirectly fostered the feeling of Asian-ness. Thus a large-scale attempt to effect a mental and spiritual conquest through the Christian missionaries was frustrated due to the remarkable absorbing qualities of the great religions of the East, namely, Hinduism, Buddhism and

Islam. But the exit of the West would not mean that Asia would revert to the old pattern, and that the Western influence would be swept away by the indigenous ways of life. Panikkar asserted that "any return to a purely Asian tradition is ruled out by the growth of social, economic and political forces which no country in Asia had to deal with in the past" (p. 500).

A recent scholar has branded *Asia and Western Dominance* as "an angry book."[4] Partially he is correct. It seemed as if Panikkar was confronting the West with a violent, critical pen. His ceaseless attack upon the Christian missionaries could not but irritate Christian readers. Reviewers like Seton-Watson (in the *Encounter*), Herbert Luthy (in the *Preuves*), and others, who wrote from the Christian point of view, were particularly bitter about the treatment of Panikkar. There is no denying the fact that at times he was extremely severe to the missionaries. But much of the fuss made about the book was due to the fact that it was a complete departure from the Anglo-Indian historiography in India. Panikkar's only fault was that he approached the problem as a true Asian who looked to the European *modus operandi* from within with a view to searching out the key to the success of the West. There is, however, a serious lacuna in his study. By Asia he meant the great land mass from India to Manchuria and Sakhalin. West Asia was overlooked, and this was indeed a serious gap. Moreover, though he studied the influence of Russia on Asia, he never made it clear whether he considered Russia as European or Asian. To my mind, if Russia is considered as an Asiatic Power, then the premise should be modified. What is striking is that Panikkar overemphasised the role of religion in meeting the challenge from the West. Asian resistance was explained in terms of cultural and religious strength as well as their continuity. There is much truth in the remark that the book is "a landmark in the historical study of Asia."[5] The consistently critical spirit and the elegant style together with the desired objectivity elevated Panikkar to a new height.

A review of the works of Sardar Panikkar reveals the wide range of interest he had regarding the study of history. To him history was an integrated concept. It cannot be realised in an isolated or disjointed manner. But he never took the reality of history for granted. To him history had a wider and much deeper appeal. He was never a dry-as-dust historian who simply performed a post mortem of facts and documents to determine the truth that was there. He took a living interest in the destiny of men and nations and had a deep insight into the future. It is the distant vision about the destiny that distinguished Panikkar from other scholars in the field of Indian history. His was a complete break-away from the tradition of British historians of India who approached the problems of the history of our country from the point of view of England. Although educated in

England and saturated with Western liberalism, he never looked at India from the Albion's distant shore. Christ Church had moulded his intellect no doubt, but it could not dissolve the true Indian self in Panikkar. The Sardar was definitely not a pro-imperialist historian. He cannot be said to be a nationalist historian either. He never completely identified himself with the nationalist thinking, though at times he saw eye to eye with the nationalists. This is clearly evident if one goes through his pamphlet *In 1857*. Judged in the context of the 1930s, he can at best be classed with the moderate nationalist historians. Though he had a great appreciation for Russia and China, he cannot be characterised as a socialist. He had no theories. R. L. Mehta aptly observed in the *Shashtyabdupoorti Souvenir*, "He is too progressive to be a conservative and he will not champion the cause of the masses...."[6] If we are to give him some brand, then he may be called an individualist. If justice is to be done to this great historical figure, it must be said that he was a class by himself.

The methodology of Panikkar did not follow the old rut. The traditional method is to pile up information from archives and libraries, and to arrange them in a scientific order, but heavily laden with references and footnotes. Heavily scholastic works have a grim and repulsive appearance to a general reader who wants to draw pleasure from the reading of history books. There is much truth in what Lawrence of Arabia, the great soldier-scholar, stated to his friend: "One of the ominous signs of the times is that the public can no longer read history. The historian is retired into a shell to study the whole truth; which means that he learns to attach insensate importance to documents...."[7] If we carefully go through the works of the Sardar, it will be apparent that he did not resort to a record-oriented research, pure and simple. He was not to be swallowed by documents, so to say. In the eyes of orthodox scholars, perhaps, it will appear as a defect in Panikkar. They may argue that at times the subjectivity of his treatment takes his work beyond the borderline of strict history and may appear as a rationalisation of his own historical belief and notion. But, perhaps, Panikkar was in complete agreement with the observation of R. H. Tawney: "What historians need is not more documents but stronger boots."[8] George Bernard Shaw in his *Advice To A Young Critic* (p. 13) said, "Get your facts right first: that is the foundation of all style." It seems that the Sardar also believed that the arrangement of facts and not a piling of facts without proper arrangement was more important and fruitful. To him history is a delightful creation. There can be no doubt that Panikkar's name will go down in history as one who broke the hard scholarly crust of history and brought out the tender, sensitive, inner side to capture the imagination of the common man. Jawaharlal Nehru, perhaps, unconsciously echoed the sentiment of Panikkar in his message to the Indian History Congress in 1955: "Heavy scholarship has its virtues but in a democratic age we have always to think of large numbers of people and

not of the small elect."[9] Democratization of history does not, however, mean the sacrifice of historical truth on the altar of mass liking. Panikkar's histories are not distortions; but "their address is less to the understanding than to the higher emotion of man."[10]

Panikkar's general view of history had a deep imprint on his study of Indian history. "The school of thought," he wrote, "which looks upon history as a system of national apologetics has but little justification in its favour. Nor can the history of any country be considered as a grand procession of great men, or a majestic stream of progress broadening with every age, and from precedent to precedent. But the history of a country has little value unless it deals with the conscious effort of a people to achieve a civilization, to reach better standards, to live a happier and nobler life."[11] In his Presidential address to the Calcutta session of the Indian History Congress, 1955, he rightly pointed out that Indian history was written mainly in terms of dynasties and kings of particular regions; and "consequently Indian history has acquired a reputation of being dull and uninteresting." The emphasis on political history was due to the legacy of the attitude of British historians of India. The school of history they developed never went beyond the stage of dynasties with no central connecting link. Early Indian historians taking their cue from their English counterparts, similarly bogged down in the traditional approach. Panikkar urged that the first requisite was to shed that approach towards Indian history. There is no doubt that Indian history viewed from the point of view of the people will be an enthralling subject. Hence he suggested in his Presidential address that "the history of India has therefore to be a history of social growth and development and not primarily a political history." While European scholars had long discarded the old outlook on the writing of history, Panikkar observed that in India historians were still treading along the beaten track. He, therefore, urged them to adopt a new outlook. But this does not mean that the monograph stage of Indian history is already complete, and Indian historians, like their European brethren, can embark upon the sophistication of our history writing. Panikkar simply wanted to change the direction of historical research.

It is debatable whether history can be written without any bias. Trevelyan admitted that historians can never be entirely immune from prejudices and predilections. Even a man of Panikkar's stature could not rise above it. It is rather surprising to note that he developed what may be called a Hindu bias. In many of his writings this is pronounced. We are at a loss to explain this bias in a forward-looking, progressive and realistic mind. It is difficult to accept that this was the result of a narrow, sectarian and reactionary outlook on life and religion. His was not, however, a conscious anti-Islamic or anti-Christian outlook, as believed by some scholars. But this dichotomy in Panikkar reflected the changing intellectual mode in India. However deplorable it may be, this bias led

him to assert that "Indian history is of necessity predominantly the history of the Hindu people," and that "what is distinctly Indian has so far been Hindu."[12] What is more intriguing is that this Hindu bias in Panikkar is not a reaction to anything. Therefore, the only plausible excuse may be that in spite of his Oxford education and liberal attitude, the orthodox Hindu tradition perhaps lay dormant in the deep layers of his otherwise progressive mind. Another weakness—I would not call it a bias actually —in Panikkar was that he often attempted to rationalise his own experience. A careful reader of *The Indian Princes in Council* or *The Working of Dyarchy in India* or *India and China* can easily feel it. It may be due to the fact that he was always true to his affiliation. One should not, however, imagine that the bias of Panikkar stunted his historical sense or blurred his method of scientific investigation in the field of historical research. His glorification of Hindu culture does not prove that he is a revivalist historian. Despite his great appreciation for the Hindu tradition, we never find him giving a "back to the Vedas" call. Time and again he clearly stated that it would be a foolish dream to imagine a retreat to the past tradition. In his Convocation address in Visva-Bharati in December 1955, he even deprecated any suggestion to revert to the *Tapovana* system. He clearly stated: "Modern India does not live under the laws of Manu. Its mental background and equipment, though largely influenced by the persistence of Indian tradition, have been moulded into their present shape by over a hundred years of Western education extending practically to every field of mental activity" (Visva-Bharati Convocation Address). Thus, he can never be, without injustice, regarded as a champion of orthodoxy. These limitations do not, of course, diminish the intrinsic merit of the studies of Panikkar. If a historian is to be judged by the legacy he leaves behind, then Panikkar is sure to occupy the front seat among Indian historians. A great historian is one who gives rise to novel ideas to be picked up by his successors. If Panikkar was at all deficient in what may be called "heavy scholarship", he amply indemnified his reputation by providing a new vision of India's history.

It is not perhaps preposterous to say that Panikkar has been somewhat neglected by Indian historians and students. But some of his studies had a tremendous impact on his contemporaries. He was better known for his study of the relationship with the Native States of India. It is no wonder, he was considered as the Lee-Warner of India. His *Asia and Western Dominance* also created a great stir. Some of the themes he postulated were, however, not seriously considered. High praise has been lavished on Panikkar by many; but his real appreciation will take place only when his studies are carried further by new researches. His reinterpretation of India's history should not be brushed aside on the plea that it was journalistic or that it was stained by a bias. The alleged sectarian outlook of

Panikkar can never be allowed to overshadow the intrinsic value of his themes. There is no denying the fact that he has opened a new vista to historical writing in India. But he never wanted to build up a school of thinking. He did not adumbrate any theory. It is debatable whether he was philosophical in his approach to history, as some writers thought; still we can easily find a distant look in his realisation of the trends of Indian history. Perhaps, the greatest tribute to Panikkar can be paid only by working out in further details some of the themes he has already given to us. It may be pointed out that the geopolitical aspect of India's history which he studied at some length requires further investigation. Similarly, to complete Panikkar's inquiry into the relation with the Native States one can undertake fresh research into the role of the States vis-a-vis the nationalist movement in India. Sardar Panikkar's imaginative mind tried to visualise India's history from a broader perspective. He tried to explain the history of this subcontinent in terms of Asian developments. He seems to have tried to discover the invisible thread of universality in the idea of history. This perspective should not be allowed to be lost in the immensity of historical details in the present-day world.

Perhaps the day is nearer when historians of modern India will be greatly impressed by the warning Panikkar gave to all concerned. He noticed a tendency fraught with grave dangers in the field of historical research. He was pained to see that historians in India still cling to the old ideas and limit themselves to the history of local dynasties or to the history of any particular region. This does not mean that Panikkar undermined local histories. What he wanted to impress upon us is that compartmentalization of Indian history, tinged with a narrow regional feeling, may have a disastrous consequence on the basic unity of Indian culture. Panikkar's warning has acquired a new significance in the context of recent developments in India. It is open to question whether people actually learn from history. The lesson of history may be real or imaginary. But the posterity only will be able to say whether Panikkar made a prophecy or not. We are too close to him to make a correct assessment of his historical thinking.

REFERENCES

1. Barun De, "Sardar K. M. Panikkar" in the *Bengal Past and Present*, Jan.-June, 1964.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Bengal Past and Present*, Jan.-June, 1964, p. 72.

5. *Sardar K. M. Panikkar—Shashtyabdupoorti Souvenir*, edited by B. J. Chacko.
6. B. J. Chacko, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
7. David Garnett, *The Letters of T. E. Lawrence*, p. 559.
8. Quoted in W. K. Hancock, *Country and Calling*, p. 95.
9. *Proceedings of the 18th Session of the Indian History Congress*, Calcutta, 1955.
10. R. V. Poduval's article in the *Shashtyabdupoorti Souvenir*, p. 205.
11. *A Survey of Indian History*, p. 235.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 235.

DR. SURENDRA NATH SEN

DR. ANIL CHANDRA BANERJEE

(*Jadavpur University, Calcutta*)

SURENDRA NATH SEN, one of the most eminent historians of modern India, belonged to a middle-class family of the Vaidya caste. His ancestral home was in the district of Barisal in East Bengal. Born in July 1890, he passed the Entrance and First Arts examinations of Calcutta University in 1906 and 1908 respectively. There was then a break in his educational career, and adverse family circumstances compelled him to serve for some time as a teacher of a primary school in a village in the Nadia district of West Bengal. Resuming his studies in 1911 he joined the Dacca College, the premier educational institution of East Bengal, where he became a favourite pupil of Richard Bury Ramsbotham, a well-known teacher and writer on the early land revenue history of post-Plassey Bengal. Sen graduated with second class Honours in History in 1913 and took his M.A. in History in the first class in 1915, both from the Dacca College which was then affiliated to the Calcutta University and had under-graduate as also post-graduate classes.

Interested in scholarly pursuits, Sen chose teaching as his profession and joined the Robertson College, Jabalpur, under the Government of the Central Provinces and Berar, as Professor of History. After a brief term there he returned to Bengal and joined the newly opened Post-Graduate Department in the Calcutta University in 1917 as a Lecturer in History. Here he won his first distinction in the field of research. His *alma mater* conferred upon him the Ph.D. degree in recognition of the value of his work, *Administrative History of the Marathas*. A few years later he went to Oxford, worked under the guidance of S. M. Edwardes, and secured the B.Litt. degree on his work, *Military System of the Marathas*. On his return to his teaching post in Calcutta he was promoted to the newly created post of Asutosh Professor of Medieval and Modern Indian History which he continued to hold for a decade till his appointment, in 1939, as Keeper of Records in the Imperial Records Department of the Government of India. After Independence this Department was named National Archives of India and its Chief was designated Director. In the fifties Sen joined the University of Delhi first as Professor of History, and then as Vice-Chancellor. After his retirement he worked for some time as Visiting Professor in the University of Wisconsin in the United States. In recognition of his outstanding contributions to Indian history the University of

Oxford conferred upon him the D.Litt. degree *honoris causa*. His last years were clouded by disease and suffering. He died in July 1962.

Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, the greatest educationist of modern India, organised post-graduate teaching under the direct control of the Calcutta University in 1917 with a view to improving the standard of higher teaching and promoting researches in various branches of learning. He recruited brilliant young teachers for the new Post-graduate Departments in Arts and Science, and Sen was one of them. He belonged to a gifted band of promising scholars, including Radhakrishnan, C. V. Raman, R. C. Majumdar, M. N. Saha, S. N. Bose, and a host of others. In the History Department Sir Asutosh made special arrangements for the study of the history of the Rajputs, the Sikhs, and the Marathas. Sen chose the history of the Marathas as his subject, and although in later life he cultivated other branches of modern Indian history, his primary interest lay concentrated in his first choice.

In the twenties ancient Indian history enjoyed the pride of place in historical studies. In Calcutta Sir Asutosh Mookerjee created the Carmichael Professorship of Ancient Indian History and Culture (there was no Professorship of Medieval or Modern Indian History at that time) and invited D. R. Bhandarkar to join it. Young teachers like R. C. Majumdar and H. C. Raychaudhuri took up researches in ancient Indian history to which important contributions had already been made by Rajendra Lal Mitra, R. C. Dutt, R. G. Bhandarkar and Radha Kumud Mookerjee. Sen had predecessors in Grant Duff, Ranade, and Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar; but for purposes of research the post-Aurangzib period of Maratha history was practically a virgin field. With his mind stimulated by contact with the Swadeshi movement in which his own district (Barisal) played an important role, Sen found in the role of the Marathas in Indian history an appropriate theme.

It was, however, an exacting theme, with a very wide scope and scattered source-materials in several languages. Sen refused to follow the old beaten track of dependence on translations. The first point in his methodology was the full exploration of source materials in original, so that accurate and faithful interpretation of facts might follow. So he made a careful study of Marathi, Persian and Portuguese, three languages with which every sincere student of Maratha history must have a first-hand acquaintance. English, of course, presented no difficulty. Sen put his linguistic equipment to test in his translation of the *Sabhasad Bakhar* (*Siva Chhatrapati*). It was a translation with a difference: a scholarly and faithful presentation of the text, not a bold and partially incorrect summary of its contents. To the same category belongs his *Foreign Biographies of Shivaji*. These two works testify to Sen's interest in the career of Shivaji, but he

did not proceed to write a political biography presumably because he had greater interest in another aspect of Maratha history.

Political history was usually the subject selected for research by pioneers in those days. But the translator of Shivaji's indigenous and foreign biographies preferred the history of institutions, indicating thereby the originality of his point of view and anticipating one of the lines on which historical studies would develop in later years. In his first major work, *Administrative System of the Marathas*, he demonstrated that the Marathas were not mere plunderers but were capable of building up administrative institutions interlinked with their social and political traditions. It was a challenge to the British-sponsored view on the historical role of the Marathas, the so-called 'predatory power'; it was an appeal for reorientation of outlook. Half a century has elapsed since Sen laid down this new and promising track for students of Maratha history; but political history has asserted its claim with such vigour and persistence that his monumental work has yet found no worthy supplement or successor. During the last years of his life he was anxious to bring out a new and revised edition, incorporating fresh materials and ideas which have accumulated since its publication; but other preoccupations and declining health prevented him from undertaking this arduous task.

Complementary to the *Administrative System* is the *Military System of the Marathas* which Sen wrote during his residence at Oxford. He knew how difficult it was for a civilian to write intelligently and critically about military matters. One could, of course, summarise the available source-materials and make superficial comments about the difficulties and mistakes of political and military leaders. But Sen wished to go deeper into the mysteries of military science. He read the standard English works on military history, particularly those relating to the Peninsular War, and made an extensive tour of Spain and Portugal with a two-fold purpose: to explore the Portuguese archives in search of new materials on Maratha history, and to understand through personal observation of the scenes of the Peninsular War how military movements are affected by the terrain. His labours gave him a rich dividend. Judged as a whole, the *Military System* ranks higher than the *Administrative System* as a scholarly performance. Though writing on a technical and unfamiliar theme, the author was able to utilise his intensive collection of materials as also his growing experience and maturity. A pioneer work on military history, the *Military System* offers interesting clues to the understanding of Maratha history and remains without a rival to this day.

Sen did not undertake any further major work on Maratha history during the last three decades of his life. From time to time he wrote interesting papers, some of which were published in his *Studies in Indian History*, *Off the Main Track*, and *Early Career of Kanhoji Angria and other Papers*. Various preoccupations and administrative work kept him too busy for solid

scholarly work which demanded hard and sustained labour. But the scholar in him was never eclipsed by the administrator; the study of history in its various forms claimed his time and attention. He presided over the Early Medieval and Rajput History Section of the Indian History Congress at Allahabad in 1938. Six years later he was elected General President of the Indian History Congress at Madras. On both occasions he delivered Presidential addresses which were remarkable for deep historical insight and freshness of ideas. To the Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission (of which he was for many years *ex officio* Secretary in his capacity of Keeper of Imperial Records) he contributed some useful papers on different aspects of modern Indian history. He was one of the patriarchs who founded and guided the Indian History Congress in its early years and organised the plan for the publication of a *Comprehensive History of India* in twelve volumes under its auspices. He undertook to edit volume IX (1712-72), but was unable to make more than a formal start. He reorganised and expanded the Imperial Records Department with a view to enriching its collection and providing better facilities for research. He presided over its development into the National Archives of India.

During his busy years in the Imperial Records Department Sen edited two important works of considerable historical value. The first was *Prachin Bangla Patra Sankalan* (Collection of Old Bengali Letters) which was the first volume of the series entitled Records in Oriental Languages sponsored by the Imperial Records Department. It contains the hitherto unpublished texts of 169 letters written in Bengali, throwing much light on the history of north-eastern India (Cooch Behar, Bhutan, Assam, Cachar) between 1779 and 1820. The editor's Introduction and explanatory notes help the reader's understanding of obscure historical transactions. Moreover, the letters represent an early stage of the development of Bengali prose and testify to the influence of Bengal's language and culture over extensive regions in eastern India. The other work was the *Indian Travels of Thevenot and Careri*, a volume in the Indian Records Series published by the National Archives of India. The editor's Introduction is a valuable contribution to the history of India in the seventeenth century.

Called upon to deliver the Sir William Meyer Lectures at the University of Madras, Sen wrote an interesting volume entitled *India Through Chinese Eyes*, throwing new light on a subject which had no point of contact with his field of specialisation. In *Delhi and Its Monuments* he gave a popular account of the architectural remains of Delhi against the background of medieval Indian art.

Sen's last major work was *Eighteen Fifty-seven*. In 1955 Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the then Minister for Education, Government of India, decided that 'a new history of the Indian struggle of 1857' should be prepared under official auspices, and invited Sen to undertake this task. He

was given less than a year and a half to prepare the volume. "The time allowed," he wrote in his Preface, "was by no means adequate, the source materials, though one-sided, were voluminous, the subject itself bristled with difficulties." But he accepted this assignment because he thought that "a fresh review of the causes, character, and consequences of the Sepoy war was well worth attempting."

The only directive which the author received from the Government of India, through the Education Minister, was that the book should be written 'from the standpoint of a true historian'. Maulana Azad wrote in his Foreword: "Beyond this general instruction, there was no attempt to interfere with his work or influence his conclusions. The responsibility for the selection and interpretation of events is therefore exclusively his. The Government of India are not in any way committed by any expression of his opinions." Sen himself wrote that his work was "not an 'authorised version' in any sense." It is creditable to the Government of India as also to the author that an officially sponsored work on a subject which not only 'bristled with controversies' but also provoked prejudices both in India and in Britain could be written 'objectively and dispassionately'. Sen sought (as Maulana Azad observed) "neither to condemn nor to condone, and treated the British and the Indian participants in the struggle in a truly historical perspective."

Historians are frequently called upon to deal with controversial topics or subjects, and they are required by the ethics and traditions of their profession to maintain an attitude of dispassionate objectivity. In most cases, however, their difficulty is partly lightened by the fact that the issues which exercise their critical judgement are practically dead issues; divorced from the current sentiments and living interests, they can be viewed in the proper perspective. Sen had this advantage only to a limited extent while writing on the stirring incidents of 1857. There were, as he wrote, "preconceived theories and deep-rooted convictions"; but he hoped that time—the 'great healer'—would soften the surviving prejudices. To some extent he was right; in 1955-56 rational Indians and Englishmen were no longer inclined to justify the follies and atrocities committed by their respective ancestors a century ago. But a serious threat to an objective review was posed by a new factor: the exuberance of emotional nationalism which assigned to the events of 1857 a deeper meaning and a wider significance than objective historical criticism could accept without reservation.

The tide was at its height when Sen was writing, but he was too mature a scholar and too critical an interpreter to be swept away. His 21-page chapter entitled 'A Review' contains his final conclusions on the character of 'the movement of 1857' and its long-term influence on Indian history. He refused to idealise 'the Mutiny' as a 'national war' except in two regions, Oudh and Shahabad; at the same time he refused to 'dismiss it as a mere military rising'. In his view "the Mutiny leaders" really "wanted

a counter-revolution"; had they succeeded, the country would have "gone back to the good old days when a commoner could not expect equal justice with the nobles, when the tenants were at the mercy of the talukdars, and when theft was punished with mutilation." Such assessment did not suit the emotional theory which elevated all leaders of 1857 to the status of fighters for freedom. Sen did not ignore the impact of the struggle on the later phases of India's fight for freedom. In the early years of the present century, he observed, many young minds lost faith in constitutional agitation and were "inspired by the memory of the Mutiny"; during the two world wars "the Indian revolutionaries did not relax in their efforts to organise another military rising." The shadow of 1857 was indeed a lingering one.

Eighteen Fifty-seven illustrates Sen's methodology as a narrator of facts and as an interpreter of their meaning in the context of historical development. The source-materials, he says, are 'one-sided'. The British side is more than adequately represented in voluminous official papers, published and unpublished, as also in contemporary and semi-contemporary books and tracts. While making full use of this category of source-materials, he tried to extract the Indian version of the movement from scattered materials, such as the papers of Maulavi Rajab Ali, the account of Munshi Mohan Lal, the diary of Kedarnath, etc. Abundance of 'one-sided' materials is the main problem of the historian of the Revolt of 1857; so far as the narrative of facts is concerned, Sen solved it in a manner which left little room for future controversy. On the interpretation of the aims and purposes of the movement and its enduring impact on the rulers and the ruled, opinions will continue to differ; but Sen's analysis and assessment have set up a high standard of historical judgement which can hardly be assailed even by the emergence of new points of view.

In Calcutta, where Sen taught in the University for more than two decades, Maratha history attracted many brilliant students, some of whom in their later life made valuable contributions to the subject. For more than a decade he worked in Delhi, in the Archives as also in the University, and came into contact with many students and teachers of History from different parts of the country. As Secretary to the Indian Historical Records Commission and as a patriarch of the Indian History Congress, he maintained contact with scholars working in different sectors of Indian history; his advice and guidance were freely asked for and generously given. He did not establish any particular 'school' of researchers either in Calcutta or in Delhi, but his influence on the progress of historical scholarship in India was both wide and deep. Moreover, his learning and enthusiasm infected Indian studies in the United States through his teaching in Wisconsin and his contact with American scholars in other centres.

Sen belonged to a generation of students who loved a flamboyant

style, but his English prose was limpid and graceful. Take, as a random example, his one-sentence picture of the seventeenth century European travellers in India: "They came from diverse countries by diverse routes on diverse missions; some in quest of trade, some in search of career, and yet others, a small minority, to seek diversion in new countries among new peoples with strange manners and novel customs."

He was an equally good writer of Bengali prose. His Introduction to the *Prachin Bangla Patra Sankalan* is a model of historical narrative in clear and forceful Bengali. He wrote three historical works in Bengali: *Peshwadiger Rastrashasan Paddhati* (The Peshwas' System of Government), *Asoka* and *Hindu Gauraber Sesh Adhyaya* (The Last Chapter of the Glory of the Hindus). The book on Asoka is a popular version of his career and achievement; the other two are scholarly works. He also wrote in Bengali a biography of Aswini Kumar Datta, the well known nationalist leader of his own district, Barisal. Far more curious is the fact that Sen wrote in Bengali a book on birds (*Pakhir Katha*) as also two children's books on animals. It is unusual indeed for a profound student of history to take so much interest in the study of scientific subjects.

Sen's distingusihed career is unique in many respects. Qualities of head and heart enabled him to rise from the humble position of a primary school teacher to the rank of the country's foremost historians and educational administrators. The fire of patriotism burnt in his heart from his early youth in the era of the Swadeshi movement. In private life he was generous to all and affectionate to his pupils. Every student of Indian history in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries must acknowledge his debt to his works. Later research will supplement and correct his conclusions, but it is unlikely that they will ever be entirely superseded: they stand on the granite foundations of critical exploration of source-materials and uncompromisingly dispassionate interpretation of facts.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI

DR. S. KRISHNASWAMY

(Friends' World Institute, Bangalore)

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI was born on July 9, 1890, at Chidambaram, South Arcot district, Madras State, in a South Indian Brahmin family which, since the days of the East India Company, had produced "many distinguished lawyers, teachers and public servants." He had his education from the primary to the collegiate level in institutions which were founded and patronised by some non-Brahmin leaders who at this time were seriously disturbed by Brahminical domination of most of the modern professions in the state. His high academic distinction at the graduate examination in 1909 won for him a place on the staff of his *alma mater*, the Pachaiayappa's College, Madras, which he retained with distinction for more than two decades. It is not known why he preferred teaching to the more lucrative Indian Civil Service which was highly coveted by many bright young Indians of this period, but the fact that he began to write a thesis for his Master's degree soon after his graduation may indicate that his involvement in the academic world was deliberate and serious, and not accidental. However, during the first decade of his long teaching career, Chari appears to have concentrated on gaining excellence in the art of teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels without attempting to publish even his Master's thesis on the Gingee history which he completed successfully in 1913.

It was probably around the year 1923 that he made up his mind to devote a part of his time for research and writing which, in addition to teaching, remained from this time on, his favourite occupations for the rest of his life. His publications in the years 1923 and 1924 indicate that he was hoping at this period to explore the possibilities of choosing certain unexplored themes in the field of pre-British south Indian history, particularly the Tamil political history which had fascinated his illustrious senior colleagues like Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar and Professor K. V. Ramaswamy Iyengar. Using the published works of some Indian and European scholars and the inscriptional records which were published periodically by the Archaeological Survey of India, besides some ancient Tamil literary works which he accepted uncritically for the most part, Chari made in these early years of his writing five major contributions, mostly in non-academic journals, on the institutional and dynastic history of the pre-British south India. His first article entitled "Some Phases of

South Indian Polity with Special Reference to Tamils" appeared in a college magazine in 1923. Identifying himself with the Aryan school of thought which held that the impetus to the growth of Aryo-Dravidian culture in the south was provided by the peaceful penetration of the Aryans, Chari cited a number of examples in this paper to show how the Aryan influence had contributed to the growth of the south Indian polity and literature. In the same year, his second major article entitled "South India's Cultural Gifts to India" was published in the *Educational Review*, Madras. Based on Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar's Calcutta University Readership Lectures of 1923 on "Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture", this article of Chari enumerates the various contributions which the south had made in the past to the evolution of Indian culture in the fields of religion, art and politics, while acknowledging the north's cultural gifts to India. Between the years 1924 and 1926, the *Young Men of India*, Madras, published his serialised article called "The Evolution of Political Institutions in South India", which, in a lengthy narrative form, traces how "the corporate life manifested itself prominently in the village and caste organisations, and with less intensity in schools, crafts, etc. in South India from the time of Aryan penetration to the sixteenth century A.D. At the Third All India Oriental Conference, held at Madras in 1924, Chari read a paper on "The Influence of South Indian Imperialism on Medieval Hindostan", in which he traced in the light of some inscriptional evidences the influence exerted by the imperialistic adventures of some South Indian chieftains on the political and dynastic history of north India from the eighth to the eleventh century A.D. In all these early writings, his analytical skill and fluency of style which contributed much to his success as a writer are clearly illustrated, even though only a few of them could be considered his original contributions to the field of pre-British south Indian history.

Around the year 1924-25, Chari appears to have perceived rightly that the early phase of the British rule in the Madras Presidency, for which there was an abundant collection of unexplored materials in the Madras Record Office, afforded him a much greater opportunity to make original contributions than ancient south Indian history, for which the sources (particularly the dependable ones) were not only limited, but also mostly utilised by his predecessors. His interest in the early period of British rule appears to have been roused first by the manuscript records and collections of Colin Mackenzie and Robert Orme, and also of the Abbé Dubois. At the fourth session of the Indian Historical Records Commission which met at Madras in 1924, he read a paper entitled "Robert Orme and Colin Mackenzie: Two Early Collectors", and emphasized upon the importance of the records of Orme and Mackenzie to the students of the early British rule in south India. At the next session of the same Commission which met at Lahore in the following year, he read another paper entitled

"The Promotion of Dravidian Studies in the Company's Days." Based on a number of primary sources, this article traces the valuable contributions made by the Catholic and Protestant missionaries and also by the Company's government to the development of the Dravidian languages till about the middle of the nineteenth century. His third paper to the Indian Historical Records Commission was "The Abbé Dubois in the Baramahal Records" (1926), in which he gave some interesting details of the correspondence of the Abbé Dubois with some British officials of the Carnatic, illustrating his "concern for the moral and material welfare of the people." "The First Burmese War and the Madras Army" was the subject of his fourth paper presented to the Indian Historical Records Commission which met at Rangoon in 1927. No part of this paper is based on primary sources, and no attempt was made by its author to compare the account of the Burmese war, as given by the British writers and rulers, with the contemporary Burmese accounts; but it is a good illustration of Chari's ability to use the secondary sources creatively in reconstructing the past episodes. From this time on, his devotion to the early period of the British rule in south India steadily increased, even though occasionally he strayed from this field and wrote on some unrelated subjects like "The Critical Phase of the U.S.A. Federation" (in the *Rev. Fr. P. Carty Commemoration Volume, 1941*) and "The German Imperial Chancellor (1870-1918)" (for the Indian Political Science Conference, 1943), apparently in response to the professional requests of his friends.

From 1924 to 1931 when he moved to Annamalai Nagar to take the Chair of History and Politics in the newly-founded Annamalai University, Chari appears to have spent considerable time in the Madras Record Office, exploring the possibilities of choosing new themes and new sources for his investigation in the eighteenth century Madras history. But there was no single theme in which he specialised even during this period, even though from this time on his major area of interest continued to be the eighteenth century Madras history. His most outstanding works on the early modern Madras history during this period are, "The Early Development of the Government of the Presidency of Fort St. George", which was published in the *Indian Antiquary*, Bombay, in 1927-28, and "The Economic Condition of the Madras Presidency on the Eve of the British Conquest", which was the subject of his Readership Lectures in the Madras University in 1929. The former paper traces in the light of official sources and published works the problems that the British traders and officials had to encounter at different stages in developing a settled government in and around Madras since the foundation of the fort in 1639, while the latter one agrees with the main conclusion reached by Srinivasaraghava Iyengar in his Memorandum on the *Progress of the Madras Presidency during the Past Fifty Years of British Administration* (1893), that the Presidency had been rapidly recovering from the chaotic situation

created in the Carnatic by the Anglo-French and the Anglo-Mysore wars, but its chief merit is that it takes each district separately and examines how the restoration was effected in each of them by the British officials during the nineteenth century. Another interesting contribution of Chari at this time on the early modern Madras history was the "Right and Left Hand Caste Disputes in Madras in the Early Part of the Eighteenth Century", which he presented at the session of the Indian Historical Records Commission at Gwalior in 1929. After tracing in this paper the history of the conflict between these two ancient factions in Madras during the eighteenth century, Chari examined the origin of the two caste divisions in another paper in the following year. Three years later, Chari made another interesting contribution to the early period of modern Madras history called "The Village Organisation in the Madras Presidency at the Time of the Introduction of the British Rule", in which after tracing how the villages in this area were governing themselves through their own locally-elected *Panchayats* prior to the advent of the British rule, he pointed out that the dropping out of the *Panchayat* system and the vesting of the control over the villages in the bureaucratic machinery under the British rule had deprived the villages of local initiative and direction in their development, and recommended the implementation of the programme of decentralisation which the Montagu report suggested.

Until a few years before his departure for Annamalai, Chari's interests in the eighteenth century Madras history continued to be diffused, but around the year 1930-31, he appears to have developed a special interest in the political developments in the Carnatic, and particularly in the Nawabs of the Carnatic and their relations with the European commercial powers during the first half of the eighteenth century. It was at this time that the Madras University had decided to get the Persian chronicles on the Carnatic Nawabs translated into English and appointed its Senior Reader in Islamic Studies, Mr. Muhamad Hussain Nainar, for the purpose. Chari worked closely with Nainar and edited the translated chronicles which appeared in four volumes between the years 1934 and 1944. His articles on the Carnatic Nawabs which appeared in various journals in the 1930's are based for the most part on a Persian chronicle called *Tuzuk-i-Walajahi*, compiled in 1780-81 by Burahana'd-din, a courtier of Nawab Muhamad Ali, which narrates the chief events in the Carnatic in the reigns of Anwar-ud-din and Muhamad Ali Walajah till the year 1761. For example, a year before his departure for Annamalai, he had an article on the Carnatic Nawabs published in the *Muslim Review*. In the same year he wrote another paper exclusively on Nawab Anwar-ud-din for the Indian Historical Commission (1930). Both the articles are based primarily on the new discovery, namely, the *Tuzuk-i-Walajahi*, which Nainar was then translating. In the year 1931, Chari read his "Notes on the History of the Carnatic from the accession of Anwar-ud-din to the

death of Nasir Jung (1750)" at the Indian History Congress in Bombay. Comparing the information supplied by the *Tuzuk-i-Walajahi* with the *Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai*, in which also he was then getting interested, Chari narrated in this article the story of the struggle between the Muslim aspirants to the Nawabship of the Carnatic and to the Nizamship of the Deccan, and the involvement therein of the English and the French commercial powers during the mid-eighteenth century.

After his migration to Annamalai, the seat of Tamil scholarship, Chari renewed his interest in the pre-British Tamil history which had been his favourite field when he began his writings in the late twenties of the present century. Since one of the major aims of the foundation of the Annamalai University was to foster Tamil language and literature, Chari naturally tried his best to make some contributions to this field. Moreover, having come away from Madras, his access to the records, particularly the official records, must have become difficult. His works on the ancient Tamil history which appeared during the early years of his stay in Annamalai were: firstly, "Some Political Ideas in the Tamil Work, Kural" (1933), in which he reiterated his old view that the impetus to the growth of Tamil art and literature was provided by the Aryan colonisers in the south, and cited several examples "to demonstrate the familiarity of the author of *Thirukkural*, with the Sanskrit political literature, and to show the comprehensive culture that marked ancient Tamil learning and scholarship;" secondly, "The Kaval System in the Tamil Country" (1935), which describes, in the light of some inscriptional evidences, how the office of the village watchman had evolved and operated in the ancient Tamilnad; thirdly, "South Indian Rural Life in the Past" (1940), in which he presented a very pleasing picture of the ancient south Indian villages and wondered whether "some measure of that fulness and harmony can now be realised in our efforts to reconstruct our rural life;" fourthly, "A Brief Survey of Jaina Contributions to Ancient Tamil Literature" (1936), in which he agreed with Bishop Caldwell and M. J. Vinson, the famous French Orientalist, that the advent of Jainism gave a tremendous boost to ancient Tamil literature and gave several examples from the Tamil literature to prove his case. He followed this up by giving another interesting account of "The Studies in the Growth of Modern Tamil" in the Silver Jubilee Number of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in 1942. Acknowledging the good "pioneer work done by missionary enterprise and both directly and indirectly by government agency also" in developing the modern Tamil literature in the past, Chari traced in this article the various stages in the evolution of the modern Tamil prose and predicted rightly that it had a good future. Chari's ability to pick some forgotten episodes and to write fascinating accounts on them, using secondary sources for the most part, is evident in many of his articles, and particularly in his account of the conquest of the Muslim kingdoms of the

south and the restoration of the Hindu temples and the Brahminical faith in places like Madura, Srirangam and Thirupati by the Vijayanagara rulers in the fourteenth century A.D. which appeared under the title, "A Great Contribution of Vijayanagara to the Tamil Country", in the *Karnataka Historical Review* in 1937.

Chari's interest in the ancient Tamil history did not, however, last long this time also. Even though the patrons of the Annamalai University always welcomed original contributions on ancient Tamil history and literature, Chari's theory that the Dravidian culture owed a great deal to the Aryan influence would not have been relished by them. The sources for the ancient Tamil history, moreover, were always inadequate, and proved undependable for a man like Chari who was becoming increasingly conscious of his responsibilities as a historian to tell the truth as he saw it. It was certainly much safer for him to go back to the eighteenth century Madras history, on which many new sources were coming to light, like the *Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai* and the Persian chronicles on the Carnatic Nawabs, in addition to the Manuscript collections of Colin Mackenzie and Robert Orme, and the East India Company's official records, many of which he had already seen while he was in Madras. Before shifting his interests back to the eighteenth century Madras history, however, Chari appears to have suddenly developed an interest in the commercial and cultural intercourse between India and South-east Asia which had been a popular subject among the Indian historians for some time past. In a sense this was an extension of his interests in ancient south Indian history, for a considerable part of the commercial and cultural contacts with the south-east Asian countries was established by the kings, traders and missionaries of south India. Using the epigraphical and literary evidences which had been made available by some European and Indian scholars, Chari tried to reconstruct in four or five of his articles the fascinating story of the migration of the Hindu and Buddhist religious ideas, rituals, customs and beliefs to various countries in south-east Asia. For example, in his "South India and Eastern Archipelago" published in 1936, in the Commemoration Volume of Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Iyengar, Chari described, mainly in the light of published works, how the process of culture-migration operated, giving several examples of the influence exerted by south Indian rulers, traders and missionaries in south-east Asia. No less interesting is his account of the "Brahminical Survivals in Siam" (1938), which, unlike the previous article, takes only one country in south-east Asia, namely, Siam, and traces how the ancient Brahminical rituals and ceremonies which had been taken over from the Brahmin colonisers from south India have survived in Siam, especially in its royal court, even though the Buddhist customs and ideas have become universal there. His third article on the subject, "Indian Culture in Indonesia", which appeared in the early years of Indian independence when India played an

influential role in building Asian solidarity, provided several new evidences to illustrate the spread of the Hindu and Buddhist ideas and institutions in the Indonesian islands. However, Chari's interests in this fascinating subject also did not last long apparently because, as in the case of ancient Tamil studies, his scope for making original contributions in this field was also extremely limited.

The year 1939, when the city of Madras celebrated its tercentenary, gave a new opportunity for Chari to shift his interests back to the early modern period of south Indian history. In that year, at the request of the Madras Tercentenary Committee, he wrote a monograph on the history of the city. Much good work had already been done on various phases of the city history by European scholars before Chari, but his *History of Madras* which appeared on the eve of the Tercentenary of the city was the first comprehensive account on the subject written by an Indian. It was also one of Chari's major contributions written in a book form. Its chief merit lies in its lucidity of style, clarity and analysis. Based mainly on the published works, such as Davison Love's *Vestiges of Old Madras*, three volumes (1913), William Foster's *The Founding of Fort St. George* (1902), Talboy Wheeler's *Madras in Olden Time* (1882), and Penny's *Fort St. George, Madras* (1900), besides the Fort Saint George records, Chari's work on Madras traces the history of the city from its foundation in 1939, and covers many aspects of its evolution which would interest not only historians and ordinary readers, but also the administrators and planners of the city, besides the tourists and specialists in city history. In addition to this major work, Chari wrote for the Madras Tercentenary Volume a separate article on "The History of the Mayoralty of Madras", in which he traced the origin and growth of the office of the Mayor of Madras from 1678 to 1935; Chari's preparation for the city history, however, appears to have begun as early as 1927 when he wrote his "Stages in the Growth of the City of Madras" for the *Journal of the Madras Geographical Association*. This was his earliest attempt "to trace the history of the city of Madras in its different stages of growth from the beginnings of the native town, through its subsequent expansion and the absorption of the neighbouring suburbs." The chief merit of this paper is that it shows how each of the suburbs was actually absorbed into the city at various times. In the following year, Chari wrote his "Notes on the Maps of Old Madras Preserved in the Madras Record Office" to supplement and illustrate the information that he had supplied in his earlier article. Perhaps the most interesting of Chari's works on Madras was his account of the attacks made on Madras by various powers during the three centuries of its history which he gave under the title, "When Madras was Attacked" in the *New Review* in 1939.

In the late thirties of the present century, Chari made some significant contributions to the history of the Maratha invasions and rule in south

India before the advent of the British power. For example, in his paper, "Shahji and His Achievements in the Carnatic", which he wrote for the Ninth Oriental Conference (1937), he traced how the great Maratha leader, Shivaji's father, Shahji, helped the Hindu cause in south India, particularly in the Mysore region and in the lower Carnatic, "even though officially and technically he was only a general of Bijapur and a representative of Mahommedan rule. Under a different title ("A Great Maratha Service to South India in the pre-Shivaji Epoch" in the *Sardesai Commemoration Volume*, 1938) he repeated the same theme and remarked that "Shahji should be remembered as the preserver, to an appreciable extent, of the Hindu heritage of Vijaynagar and its feudatory kingdoms, and as having injected into it a Maratha strain which was perhaps the only available effective remedy for its preservation" against Muslim onslaught. In 1939 Chari wrote his third major article on the Maratha activities in south India called "Murari Rao Gorepade", in which he traced "in some detail, on the basis of reliable and authentic materials available, Murari Rao's activities in the Carnatic in the two fateful decades that ended with the final triumph of the English over the French in South India." Perhaps, his most original contribution in this field was his article in the *Potdar Commemoration Volume* of 1950, called "A Tamil Account of Shivaji's Expedition to the South and the Moghul Siege of Gingee", in which he brought out the value of a Tamil chronicle called *Savistara Chaitam*, which was compiled by one Narayana Kone at the special request of Colonel William Macleod, Commissioner of Arcot during the Governorship of William Bentinck. This chronicle, says Chari, "contains very many details of the intrigues, perfidies and consequent wars; long before any Europeans intermeddled with the politics of the Peninsula," of which Orme was not aware. In the late thirties of the present century Chari contributed some articles on the early history of the French East India Company also. The most important of these are: "The First Indian Courtiers of the French East India Company", in which he traced the career and contributions of Thanappa Mudaliar, the first Indian Dubash and Courtier of the French at Pondicherry, who "paved the way for Ananda Ranga Pillai's achievements," and his descendants in the light of their family records which were made available to Chari by Monsieur Gnanou Diagou; and "The French East India Company", published in the *New Review*, 1938, in which Chari made a study of "the organisation and working of the French Company in India about the middle of the eighteenth century" and found that the "cause for the rapid collapse of the French aim" to build an empire in India must be seen not in their organisation or working which compared favourably with those of the British, but in external factors, like "the relative naval strength of the two powers and the financial backing of the two companies as well as their military equipment."

1940 was probably the most fruitful year in Chari's professional career. It was in this year that his well-known work on the *Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai* was published. In this work, Chari "presented in a condensed form the historical materials" recorded in Ranga Pillai's Diary and "enriched the extracts from the Diary with his own supplementary and explanatory notes culled from other sources of the period. The core of this book is the series of his articles entitled "The Historical Materials in the Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai" (1736-61) which appeared in 19 parts, spread over several issues of the *Journal of Indian History* (volume VI, 1927 to volume XVII, 1938), Madras. The introductory chapter of this book which gives a detailed account of "the vicissitudes through which the Diary passed to the stage of its translation into English under the auspices of the Government of Madras," as well as his notes which appear almost on every page of the book are highly useful to the students of the eighteenth century Carnatic history. The publication of this book brought Chari into close contact with the officials of the French government in Pondicherry like A. Singaravelu Pillai, Curator of the Pondicherry Records and M. Edmond Gaudart, Governor en retraite, from whom he had received valuable help in publishing his notes on Ranga Pillai's Diary. In the same year of his publication of the Diary of Pillai, the enlarged version of his Master's thesis on the Gingee history which he wrote nearly three decades earlier was translated into French by Edmond Gaudart and published in a book form by the French Historical Society, Pondicherry, of which Gaudart was then the President. Three years later, the revised and enlarged English translation of the *History of Gingee* appeared. Chari's main aim in this work was to bring to the fore the decisive role that Gingee, now only a village, had played during the eighteenth century, as one of the chief centres of "a kaleidoscopic succession of quick-changing scenes" in the Carnatic by tracing "the violent interplay of political forces that indulged in their 'witches' revel" in the decades that saw the birth of British supremacy, during which some stirring figures like Bussy, Anwar -ud-din and Hyder Ali passed over the scene. Unlike Chari's other works, the narrative in this work is very lengthy, and sometimes very tedious also, but it is probably his most original contribution to the eighteenth century history, based on a comparative study of several official and private sources.

Having edited Hussain Nainar's English translation of the Persian chronicles on the Carnatic Nawabs, and published his selections from the Diary of Ranga Pillai, and also made an original contribution on the Gingee history, Chari was now widely recognised as one of the foremost specialists in the eighteenth century Carnatic history, and a leading historian of the country, and was awarded several titles and honours by the Government and the universities in the country. From the Government he received the title of Rao Saheb in 1935, of Rao Bahadur in 1942 and

of Diwan Bahadur in 1946. The Indian History Congress elected him Sectional President in 1939 and General President in 1941. The Oriental Conference elected him President of the History Section in 1940. The Deccan History Congress elected him President of its Modern History Section when it met for the first time in 1945. He was elected an honorary life member of French India History Society of Pondicherry in 1946. The Indian Historical Records Commission, to which he had been communicating several important papers since 1926, nominated him as one of its Expert Members in 1942. From the universities of Madras, Annamalai, Osmania and Utkal he received invitations in the 1940s to deliver their Endowment or Readership Lectures. He was the obvious choice of the Government of India when it desired to get the Orme Manuscripts published in accordance with its Five-Year Publication Scheme of the Manuscript Records which it sponsored in 1942.

Chari's *Selections from Orme Manuscripts*, published posthumously in 1952, is a valuable supplement to his earlier works on the eighteenth century Carnatic history. To Chari personally, his access to the Orme manuscripts at this time gave him a fresh opportunity to compare the account provided therein with other contemporary sources and to write short articles on various episodes in the eighteenth century Carnatic history which had fascinated him since 1930. Between the years 1938 and 1950, he contributed ten articles to various journals on different aspects of the eighteenth century Carnatic history, basing his sources on the Orme Manuscripts, Ranga Pillai's Diary and the Persian chronicles on the Carnatic Nawabs, besides a number of official records and some less significant indigenous sources. For example, at the Indian History Congress in Allahabad in 1938, he read a paper called "The Carnatic and Nasir Jung, 1749-50", in which he traced the crucial events in the Carnatic politics with Nasir Jung as the central figure in his story. The hero of his second article on the Carnatic history was the Nawab Muhammad Ali who, in his opinion, was responsible for the famous 'diversion of Arcot' which contributed ultimately to the British success in the Carnatic. Some interesting sidelights in the career of another Carnatic hero, Chanda Saheb, were brought out by Chari in his third article of this period on the Carnatic called "A Little Known Phase in the Career of Chanda Saheb, 1741-48", which he presented at the nineteenth session of the Indian Historical Records Commission (1942). His fourth article, dealing exclusively with the battle of Ambur, August 3, 1749, was presented to the Indian Historical Records Commission in 1943. In the same year, the *Muslim Review* published his serial article called the "Arcot Interest and Parliament," in which he described the impact of the Nawab of Arcot's debts to the English Company and its officials on the English Parliament wherein the controversy over the issue was protracted. Chari narrated the same story under another title, "The Nawab of Arcot's Debts and Their Political Repercussions", in the *Hindustan*

Review in 1943. On the controversial issue of the abolition of the titular dignity of the Nawabship of Arcot by the British, Chari had two articles, "The Sovereign Status of the Nawabs of Carnatic Discussed in the Recorder's Court and the Supreme Court at Madras in the years 1798-1811" (presented to the 22nd session of the Indian Historical Records Commission, 1945), and "The Abolition of the Titular Dignity of the Nawab of Arcot" (presented to the 23rd session of the Indian Historical Records Commission, 1946), bringing out the legal and political factors that centred round the issue. His other articles on the Carnatic history elaborate the themes which he had presented in his earlier articles on the subject.

These articles of Chari not only filled some of the major gaps in facts which the British writers like Orme and Mill had left in their accounts of the eighteenth century Carnatic history, but they also brought out the significant role played by some Indian leaders like Anwar-ud-din, Chanda Saheb and Mohammad Ali, on whom the British writers gave very little information. A much greater contribution of Chari to the eighteenth century Carnatic history in particular and to Indian history in general was his focussing the attention of his colleagues on the value of the newly discovered indigenous sources, like the *Tuzuk-i-Walajahi* and Ranga Pillai's Diary which were not available to the early British writers. Besides showing through his own articles on the eighteenth century Carnatic history how these sources could profitably be used in reconstructing the past history, Chari also formulated certain guidelines for their use by others, since he could not possibly use all of them, and since there is always the danger of these sources misguiding even genuine scholars. His opportunity to enunciate these guidelines came in the years 1939-41 when he delivered his Presidential addresses at several historical conferences. Ornate in their style and earnest in their appeal, these Presidential addresses of Chari reveal his attitudes towards history in general and Indian history in particular. Since he spent most of his time in his search and survey of new sources for his own researches into the eighteenth century Carnatic history, the only occasions that he had to probe into some of the fundamental questions in Indian historiography and methodology in history were those when he was called upon to deliver Presidential addresses at historical conferences.

The most fundamental question that he raised in almost all his Presidential addresses is "What is the function of the historian in the modern world and how should he perform it?" Giving his own answers to this question, Chari declared in one of his addresses: "The writer of history" should not only try to give "a correct, impartial and just interpretation of facts of Indian history, but also make a supreme effort to ascertain their real significance, so as to illustrate that search after truth is after all far more ennobling than quest after facts." The highest truth in historical research, he declared on another occasion, "should be its freedom from

every partiality and ideology and its entire dependence on its material for its conclusion." "The exploitation of historical sources should always be conducted with a critical mind and with judgement," he added, and the "building of conclusions should be made on the most thorough and unprejudiced bases possible." His greatest appeal to the members of his profession was "to save history from being tied to the chariot-wheel of perverted sectionalism." "History is not a propaganda, nor is it a rude and vulgar publicity," he warned, and protested against the dangerous tendency that was current in the country to present "exaggerated pictures of the achievements of the earlier generation with a view to infusing in us a sense of pride." One way of getting over the common prejudices of nationalism, he thought, would be to cultivate an international approach. "If history is to be fruitful," he held, "it is essential that it should move away from its conventional background and get, in a marked manner, into the lines of a truly international approach." "True history," he added, "should be comprehensive, and not merely nation-wide, but also extend particularly in the portrayal of cultures, their origins and dispersion, to a continental and even inter-continental background." "Many phases of Indian history, markedly those relating to filiations of Dravidian culture and origins and spread of Indian civilisation in Indonesia and Serindia," he urged, "require that the historian should extend his understanding from the conventional, narrow and possibly sub-national, and project it on a truly international background."

He conceded that history gains its intellectual excellence through the intensity of the personal feelings of its author, but when this feeling is born out of prejudice, he declared, it becomes a great obstacle to the "development of the true historiographic art." He also saw the shortcomings of the pure "scholastic, frigid and unemotional spirit of scholarship" which makes history dull and drab. He urged his colleagues to try to arrive at a "more or less close approximation to the golden mean" between the two extremes in writing their accounts. These profound appeals must have exerted a great influence on the younger generation of scholars, particularly his own students who are now teaching in various parts of south India, but its extent is hard to determine. Chari's own writings should serve as a model to many young writers of history. He wrote and wanted others to write history "without love or hate". A painstaking and conscientious scholar as he was, he was most happy when he had a minute problem to work, limited both in time and space, and was always on his guard against the temptation, so common among scholars, to universalise what is really the unique and to generalise what is really the particular.

K. P. PADMANABHA MENON

M. G. S. NARAYANAN

(*University of Calicut*)

K. P. PADMANABHA MENON lived between the year of the Great Mutiny and the year of the second instalment of Constitutional reforms—a period of intense creative activity in all walks of Indian life. The beginnings made then are bearing fruit in our own times. When his pioneering works in Kerala history were produced, there was no Kerala state as such but only three separate political units—the Malabar district of the Madras Presidency and the two native states of Cochin and Travancore—united by the common bond of society, language and culture. There was no university in this area, but, thanks to missionary enterprise and royal patronage, the Malayalees or Keralites were next only to the Bengalis in taking to English education on a large scale and exposing themselves to the impact of new Western culture. Popular interest in history, as different from legend, was a by-product of this Western influence. Even today Mr. Menon happens to be the most widely known writer on Kerala history for the outside world for the reason that his works can be read in the English language.

Few historians can claim a hereditary title for the job like Padmanabha Menon. His father was Puthur Madhathil Shankoonny Menon, Triprayar, Cochin, the famous author of *A History of Travancore* (English, 1878). This gentleman had joined the Travancore service as a petty clerk and retired as Dewan Peishkar. The son's interest in history, though not his outlook, was probably inherited from his father. It was only natural that Padmanabha Menon in his turn wanted to do for Cochin what his father did for Travancore and if possible go one step further and prepare a history of Kerala as a whole. However, the father who attained high status through government service was essentially a court historian while the son who cherished his independence as a lawyer was the first of academic historians in Kerala. His interest in law as profession and history as hobby complemented each other and most probably his membership of an orthodox aristocratic matrilineal Nair joint family of Cochin through his mother, Elamakkara Krishnathu Puthen Veetil Parvati Amma, induced him to take up the study of the historical and legal aspects of the changing Marumakkathayam system in the first instance.

The last of three children of his parents, Padmanabha Menon exhibited a studious nature from the beginning. He received the traditional

"*Nilatheluthu*" training and private tuition in English also. After a period in Cherthala district school, he spent seven years—1866 to 1873—in Ernakulam Maharaja's High School and one year in Trivandrum Maharaja's High School. He took his F.A. in 1876 and B.A. (History) in 1879 from the Madras Presidency College. In those days his charming behaviour and industry were commended by Principal Thompson.

Contrary to the wishes of his father, who wanted his sons to follow him in Travancore service, Padmanabha Menon took his B.L. degree in 1884 and served as an apprentice under Sir. H. H. Sheppard, then Advocate -General to the Government of Madras and afterwards High Court Judge in Madras and Adviser to the Secretary of State for India. He undertook an extensive tour of India to complete his education. In 1885 he started practice in the Madras High Court, but in order to be near his aged mother, he shifted to Ernakulam and started practice before the Appeal Court of the Cochin State. Soon he reached the top of his profession. His "sound knowledge of law", "independence and honesty", "perseverance and thoroughness" in the discharge of duties, and conduct as a "true, loyal and public spirited citizen" were generally appreciated and he was chosen by the Durbar as a member of its Legislative Committee.[1]

An interesting episode of this period, which brings out his character and attainments, became a turning-point in his life. Menon had argued for a poor client in a forest case in which the powers that be were interested in the opposite side. Not only was his client convicted, but some adverse remarks on his professional conduct were passed by the Special First Class Magistrate. Later on, a Full Bench of the Appeal Court acquitted the accused and completely exculpated the lawyer from the charges levelled against him. Menon was not satisfied. As a member of the High Court Bar of Madras, he placed all the papers before Sir Arnold White, Advocate -General in Madras. According to Sir White, "the written argument showed great ability and erudition" and there was "no foundation or justification for the charges" and the Magistrate committed "a serious error of judgement in taking upon himself to rebuke Mr. P. Menon in connection with his conduct."[2] He fully endorsed the conclusion arrived at by the judges of the Appeal Court. Though cleared of all allegations, Menon's mind was now set upon a change of place. This was quite natural in the circumstances which then prevailed in a native state. The address presented to him on this occasion by members of the public reveals the high esteem for his character and capacity which they entertained.

Thus in 1899 he shifted the venue of his activities to Trivandrum where his father had worked for a long time. Facilities for carrying on his researches into the history of Kerala provided an additional attraction for the place. The judges at Trivandrum expressed their pleasure at his "complete mastery" over his cases and his "lucid presentation," which, according to them, "betokened superior attainments in law, and hard

and patient labour."[3] He was nominated as a non-official member of the Legislative Council and this led later on to his membership of the Marumakkathayam Committee. He remained in Trivandrum for three years, after which "domestic affairs, considerations of health and repeated calls from old clients" compelled Menon to return to his own state.

Back at Ernakulam, he quickly regained his old position and practice. When a Marumakkathayam law was contemplated in Cochin Menon was asked to be on the Committee whose labours resulted in passing the "Nayar Regulation" of the state. His "manly independence", "many -sided scholarship", the almost religious fervour with which he maintained the high tradition of the Bar, "the purity and greatness" of his character, and the "enthusiasm" he displayed in "legal and historical studies" evoked the admiration of his colleagues and rivals at the Bar.[4]

His last will and testament included many liberal donations to temples, asylums, watersheds, educational institutions and to the Bar Association. He instituted an endowment, amounting to Rs. 17,200 in favour of the Madras University to encourage post-graduate research work in the history of ancient India. He had completed by 1910 the work of his *magnum opus*, which was later on published as *History of Kerala* in four volumes, but he was still revising it and postponing its publication in 1919 when he died leaving the editing and publishing of the book to his scholarly friend and junior colleague T. K. Krishna Menon whose remarks about the author are characterised by the devotion of a disciple and protege: "He remained a student, a systematic and diligent student, from start to finish. With him rest meant only change of work. A certain scrupulous austerity streaked his tastes. He refused to be drawn to the dissipations of social or civic life; and his circle of friends too was select and solid. His health was not robust, and his sedentary habits, mental strain and absence of physical exercise did not leave much room for improving it. And but for his wife, that tireless nurse, who dedicated her married life to preserve that of her dear husband, it would not have been possible for him to turn out the prodigious work that he did."[5]

Dark-complexioned, short, and fat, he was endowed with a broad forehead, shining eyes and full cheeks, and his usual costume included the high turban and the ear-ornament which was then fashionable. He was extremely reserved in behaviour and talk, though accessible to the great and small alike. His intimate circle included L. K. Anantha Krishna Ayyar, the anthropologist, C. Achutha Menon, the author of the *Cochin State Manual*, and T. K. Krishna Menon. Besides the *Marumakkathayam Committee Report*, the *History of Cochin*, and the *History of Kerala*, he contributed numerous articles on Kerala history and culture to the *Malabar Quarterly Review* and the *Maharaja's College Magazine* and published a series of essays in the *Western Star* on his travels to pilgrim centres in India.

Though Padmanabha Menon and his wife—Tiruvambadi Marath

Parukkutti Amma from Trichur—were blessed with a happy home and friends they had no children. They were both highly religious and fond of pilgrimage. Menon who died of pneumonia in his sixty-second year in Trichur has left behind him a rich legacy of research for the future generations of historians in Kerala.

1. *Marumakkathayam Committee Report and Memorandum* (1908): The appointment of Menon as a member of the Marumakkathayam Committee of Travancore in 1908 was responsible for inducing him to examine the history and constitution of the matrilineal system of the Nayars who formed the backbone of mediaeval society in Kerala.[6] Matriliny was of central importance to Kerala society and was necessarily connected with other subjects like the Arya-Dravida marriage called sambandham, the military-political organisation called cangatam and the peculiar Kerala system of land tenure. Thus through the study of the Marumakkathayam system he entered the study of the history of Kerala.

The unanimous report of the Committee, based on extensive research, covered the legal aspects of the sambandham, the relation between the Karnavar and junior members in a Tarwad (joint family), the partition of Tarwad property and the inheritance of self-acquired property by the children. They collected statistical information from all available government sources, prepared a questionnaire, took evidence from representatives of Samantas and Nayars in fourteen centres and held informal discussions with chosen gentlemen at Quilon, Kottayam and Trivandrum. Thus the text of the report, running into seventy-one closely printed foolscap pages, contained a comprehensive survey of Nayar society at the beginning of the present century. Even today it is considered to be a document of unsurpassed value for students of social history.

Not satisfied with the report as such, Padmanabha Menon added a separate memorandum running into seventy-two closely printed foolscap pages.[7] In this he went into the historical aspect of the institution. He discusses the origin of Marumakkathayam, quoting travellers from Abdur Razak to Buchanan and sociologists like Morgan, Maine, and Westermark. He attempts a comparative study of Marumakkathayam in Kerala and the different parts of the world outside. He gives a detailed account of the forms and ceremonies observed at Malayalee marriages. He takes up a critical textual study of *Sanakara smriti* and *Keralamahatmya*, two legendary chronicles in Sanskrit relating to the socio-political history of Kerala. With great insight into the spirit of the age, he argues forcefully for reform through legislation to enable the peaceful transformation of a matriarchal society into a patriarchal society in due course.

Apart from its intrinsic value as a historical document and as a pioneering study of the social history of Kerala, this memorandum is important in a different sense as it reveals the starting-point of Menon's researches

into the history of Kerala. The problems and puzzles which he came across in the examination of Dravidian upper class society in this part of the country seem to have taken him to the wider field of the history of Kerala through the ages. A student of his work finds in the *History of Cochin* and the *History of Kerala* the gradual development of his views first expressed in this memorandum. Therefore, it is only proper to remark that through the study of law and the advocacy of change he entered the realm of historical scholarship, a fact which explains why he was different from earlier historians interested chiefly in the political history of kings and dynasties and lacking in social outlook and therefore unable to appreciate history as a record of human cultural evolution.

2. *History of Cochin* (1912): The myth of Parasurama and the legend of Ceraman Perumal satisfied the curiosity of the Keralites regarding their own past until foreign missionaries evinced an interest in the Jewish and Syrian Christian copperplates. The *Keralolpathi* in Malayalam and the *Keralamahatmya* in Sanskrit contained the native Hindu view of history in the later middle ages, mixing up myth, legend, fact and fiction. Sheikh Seinuddin had written a history of Islam in Kerala in *Tuhfat-ul-Majahidin* in the sixteenth century. The writings of Portuguese and Dutch travellers and officials, especially those of Barbosa, Varthema and Visscher, had included some excursions into the past. Pachu Muthadu had published his *Tiruvithamkur Caritram*—a history of Travancore based on traditional chronicles—in Malayalam in 1863. In English we have *The Land of the Perumals* by Francis Day, published in 1863, and *The Land of Charity* by Rev. Samuel Mateer, published in 1871, both of which reproduced the traditional version of history. In the same period Dr. Gundhert wrote a series of articles in Malayalam on the history of Kerala from the Portuguese period which were collected later under the title *Kerala Palama.* In 1878, Shankoonny Menon, father of K. P. Padmanabha Menon, published an English book named *A History of Travancore.*

Logan's *Malabar Manual*, 1887, with its interesting chapters on history stimulated the native interest in the subject opening up a new horizon for enquiry and discussion. Nagamayya's *Travancore State Manual* followed it in 1906 and Achuta Menon's *Cochin State Manual* in 1911.

Padmanabha Menon published the two volumes of the *History of Cochin* in Malayalam in 1912 and 1914 respectively. In his preface he stated that he wrote the book to satisfy the long-felt need for a history of the state, dealing with the subject more elaborately than was possible in a state manual. In fact, his work expressed, apart from the quantitative difference which the author himself pointed out, a qualitative difference also. It was not written to please the court by praising the administration and tracing the royal pedigree back to Parasurama. The author's patriotism yields place to his passion for finding out the truth about the past.

While Logan and the other manual writers treat *Keralolpathi* as an

important source book which deserves detailed analysis, Menon dismisses it in a few paragraphs and dwells at some length only on the problems of the conversion and partition legends in respect of the last Ceraman Perumal.[8] It is true that *Keralamahatmya* and *Keralolpathi* legends have not been exorcised from the field of historical writing even long after Padmanabha Menon but as Professor Elamkulam correctly observed in his talk on "The Need for a Comprehensive History of Kerala", this backwardness persists in spite of him rather than because of him.[9] Menon also discounts the authority of the palace granthavari on account of its comparatively recent origin.[10] He distinguishes between contemporary and later sources on the one hand and primary and secondary sources on the other—a practice which was absent before him and which therefore called for sound judgement and rigorous discipline.

Another speciality of the work is the attempt to see history as a whole. The tendency to give undue prominence to political history is conspicuous by its absence here.[11] The text is divided into four books, the first dealing with the ancient period, and the others dealing with the Portuguese, Dutch, and British periods respectively. Social, religious and cultural developments occupy about three-fourths of the space.

Besides attention to sources and attention to non-political aspects of history, the attitude to problems also mark out this work as representing a new trend. His remarks are characterised by a sense of detachment and a respect for views other than his own. In dealing with the historical role of the Nayars, the community to which he himself belonged, he reproduced the favourable and adverse comments of travellers with equal justice.[12] His discussion about the Jews, the Syrian Christians, the Muslims, the Elavas, etc. proves the absence of racial, religious, or communal prejudice.[13] Moreover, while a large number of language scholars refuse even today, in spite of a large volume of evidence in support of it, to acknowledge the fact that Tamil was the official and literary language of Kerala in the ancient period, we find Menon boldly doing so on the basis of epigraphic and literary evidence.[14]

However, with all these advantages, and the well-knit and well-proportioned form of the work, the *History of Cochin* cannot be taken to represent an advanced stage of historical studies. It is merely descriptive and it lacks the benefit of specialised knowledge in archaeology, epigraphy, architecture and sculpture. The treatment of Jewish, Christian and Muslim Community life and the peculiar customs of Elavas, Pulayas, etc. is merely superficial. The nomadic tribes like the Ulladar and Kadar of Cochin are completely left out of the picture. The character of the regional version of Hinduism, resulting from a mixture of Aryan and Dravidian ideas and institutions, remains unexplained. Finally one is compelled to admit that since all the important epigraphic documents which throw light on the early history of Cochin, and some old literary works which have a

bearing on it, have been unearthed, published and studied in the last fifty years or so, all the early chapters of this book have now become completely out of date. Similarly, detailed studies of the Portuguese, Dutch and English records undertaken later have rendered Mr. Menon's observations on later history also inadequate. The truth of these remarks could become clear to any one who compares Mr. Menon's half-a-century -old history of Cochin with the history sections of the district Gazetteers published recently by the Government of Kerala.

3. *History of Kerala*: The four volumes of this work appeared posthumously between 1924 and 1937. The editor in his foreword informs us that it was completed long before 1910 though the author went on revising it for about a decade, i.e. till the end of his life. This means that the first draft was ready almost simultaneously with the *History of Cochin*, though the author does not mention it in his preface there.

It is interesting to go through the editor's comment on the *History of Kerala*. "The form of the work," says Krishna Menon, "and the delay in its publication are entirely due to his pious solicitude for historical accuracy. He knew that if he were to write a connected and complete history of ancient Malabar, there would be breaks which he could not very well fill up with authentic materials. So he took Visscher for his aid and prepared cameos on many of the important events and institutions, customs and manners and the salient features of the country, and of its social, political and economic condition, based as far as possible, on contemporary records. The work was completed long before 1910, and well -known works and papers have laid it under contribution, yet, he went on investigating matters over which there could possibly be any doubt or dispute or which could be viewed from different standpoints, so that he might present a front of unassailable veracity."

"The present was the great undertaking of his life. His numerous and valuable contributions to Indian and English journals, even his History of Cochin, may be considered as mere bouquets he prepared from the superfluous flowers he gathered for this garland. Visscher's book he has used as the thread on which to string the ancient history of Kerala."[15]

Menon's will contained the following statement: "I appoint Mr. T. K. Krishna Menon my literary executor. I request him to see my 'Notes on Visscher's Letters from Malabar' through the press after full and satisfactory revision at his hands." However, the editor evidently showed injustice to his friend by giving what the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* called the "somewhat puzzling title" of *History of Kerala* for this collection of notes. There is no connected history and no claim to that effect anywhere. Moreover, the author's use of a modest title in his will indicates his frankness and awareness of the limitations of his own knowledge and we have to appreciate his ingenuity in the choice of Visscher's Letters for

a peg to hang all the bits of information which he had collected so patiently over such a long period of time.

The author's persistence in collecting material is evident in his treatment of problems already dealt with in the earlier work like the Perumal problem, the customs and traditions of different communities like the Jews, the Syrian Christians, etc. and the role of the temple in social life. He has also added a lot of useful material on the geological factors and natural resources of Malabar, the dress and habits of the people, the advent of Brahmins, the institution of national assemblies, the system of self-sufficient semi-autonomous villages, the history of minor principalities and chieftains and the organisation of revenue, trade, and land tenure. Though the editor states in his foreword that he has done his best to make the work up-to-date and useful to historians and research scholars of the world, he is not specific about the amount of editing and revision that he himself undertook but this in itself may justify the assumption that in spite of the long delay in publication the text remains more or less unaltered.

The *Modern Review* was unjust in condemning the book as "almost an exhibition of futile scholarship" though it is true that the author's great achievement was of a negative character, i.e. to establish that no proper history of Kerala in the ancient and mediaeval periods could be gleaned from existing sources. The *Indian Historical Quarterly* was right in their assessment that the book was "substantially an annual or a gazetteer rather than a book of history" and they rightly added that "even as such it cannot fail to be attractive to a serious historian of India who can set to work only when publications of this kind have sufficiently helped him to clear up his ground." The charge of the *London Times* that "The foundation is too slight for such a massive treatment" since the Visscher letters are not very long in themselves, cannot be taken seriously when we remember that the real purpose was not to comment on Visscher but to collect in one place all information about the history of Kerala.

At the time of publication, Dr. Sudhindra Bose rightly hailed the book as a "distinguished contribution to our Indian local history" and expressed his feeling that it will be "treasured by every serious student of Indian Civilization." Professor M. Winternitz recommended the book for the study of "Indologists in general both in India and in the West" and Professor A. B. Keith praised "the author's competence and judgement" in discussions and his industry in accumulating and making accessible "the large amount of really interesting information."

The book runs into four bulky volumes. The absence of chronological order is convenient for the author but a source of embarrassment for the reader. Since it contains the raw-material for history rather than history itself it is a reference book for the research student rather than a history of Kerala.

In the words of Professor K. V. Krishna Ayyar, "we have in its four volumes what may be called an encyclopaedia of Kerala History."[16] Professor P. K. S. Raja remarks more aptly: "The title in the four volumes of Mr. K. P. Padmanabha Menon's *History of Kerala* is misleading. Written in the form of notes on Visscher's 'Letters from Malabar', the accounts given in the book are disjointed and overlapping as it naturally would be. At best it can be called an unclassified encyclopaedia of Kerala History."[17]

The defect in the form of the book is more the outcome of the scarcity of materials than the inability of the author in making use of them. He put the existing sources to maximum use and derived all the information that they could yield. However, the impetus provided by him to Kerala historical studies very soon resulted in the discovery of plenty of new sources which made his encyclopaedia completely out of date. Menon had no knowledge of the collections of hundreds of ancient Tamil songs known as the Sangam literature. Of the hundreds of Vatteluthu records from all parts of Kerala, he had before him only five, their characters imperfectly deciphered and their period a matter of wild speculation. The most important mediaeval Manipravala kavyas bearing on Kerala history were yet to be published. The original Portuguese and Dutch records remained a sealed book to him. With the advantage of hindsight, we may therefore state today that the chief defect of the book was not in its form but in its contents which, for no fault of the author, and perhaps partly due to the incentive provided by his work, have been rendered obsolete.

Menon's treatment of history generally yields the impression that foreign sources are more valuable than indigenous ones in the case of Kerala. As pointed out above, this was partly due to circumstances beyond his control. However, there is another allegation for which this explanation is not valid. Menon's inadequate knowledge of the meaning of certain rituals of Kerala Brahmins has been pointed out by Kanippayyur Sankaran Nambudirippad, a great authority on traditional Hindu science.[18] This is a serious defect, though it is not surprising that the secretiveness and aloofness which the Kerala Brahmins maintained till recently prevented a non-Brahmin like Menon from acquiring such knowledge.

A student of history today will not have much to complain about Padmanabha Menon's basic attitude. He exhibited a respectful and cautious approach to contemporary sources and a suspicious but imaginative approach to tradition.[19] His readiness in acknowledging the limitations of current knowledge is worthy of admiration. But it is evident by this time that his attempt to produce a general history of Kerala was premature. The general history of a region may profitably be taken up only after a number of separate studies are undertaken and it has to proceed by

synthesising such information. In this case, he conceived the projects of producing a history of Cochin and a history of Kerala long before the ground was prepared. In the absence of linguistic, sociological, epigraphic and archaeological analysis and the evolution of a reliable chronological order, any such scheme was bound to be over-ambitious and therefore somewhat ridiculous in consequence.

It has already been pointed out that Padmanabha Menon's writing was often merely narrative or descriptive—a weakness which he shares with several other Indian writers and which is only partly explained by the unsatisfactory nature of evidence. Here we cannot help noticing a certain conservative and pedestrian quality of the mind which is devoid of sudden flashes of brilliance or intuitive insight into the nature and relations of ideas, men and institutions. As a trained lawyer, he knew how to select his evidence and marshal the arguments in presenting his case. We do not find here that power of reconstruction, that vivid creative imagination, which leads to synthesis and which is characteristic of the great historian. He has good command of Malayalam and English but at the same time there is no individual style which makes a work of history at once a record of events and a literary venture.

The writings of Menon are not illumined by any theory of the development of society—again a charge which the majority of writers on Indian history will not be able to escape. One comes out with the impression that his notion of history is quite superficial, that he views it as a collection of facts pertaining to the past, for which it is not necessary to offer an explanation.

In some respects, however, his work is an improvement upon that of his predecessors in the field. They almost always exhibited a tendency to idealise the past, to attribute a kind of perfection to the society, institutions, ideas and arts of Kerala. There was an accent of parochial sentiment usually born of ignorance about history outside the region. If there was any change, it was, in their eyes, a change for the worse, but, for the most part, they believed that Malabar society was timeless and changeless, that, while events occurred, they fitted into a framework fixed long ago by Providence. Even Logan, an Englishman, fell into this trap when he congratulated the Malayalees for having had no history and suggested that history came to a standstill at the moment when, somewhere about the ninth century, the last Perumal set sail for Mecca.[20] Logan seems to think that, like the princess in the fairy tale, society in Kerala slept for hundreds of years until the British came with their magic wand of change. Menon is happily free from this illusion. At least he does not view medieval sloth as an idyllic posture. He noticed the actual backwardness of the matrilineal joint family of Nayars and others with the attendant evils of sambandam, polygamy and indifference towards the higher values of life.

While his predecessors including Logan saw only the brighter side of

traditional Kerala system, Menon observed the anarchical and decadent trends in it, making out a case for reform. He is never extravagant in his praise of anything in the past of Kerala. Though he is not able to see the movement of history in perspective, and does not possess the philosopher's or the sociologist's eye, he seems to be vaguely conscious of a process of evolution or gradual progress from primitive to civilized life.

When compared to other native writers it certainly goes to the credit of Menon that he exhibited the courage to discount the miracle story about the creation of Kerala and examine the basis of Brahmin supremacy with an objective sense. Even though the Christian missionaries and Logan were able to take a detached view of Hindu mythology, which was alien to them, it was much more difficult for a son of the soil to do so for the first time. Notwithstanding his religious convictions, he refused to bring in God or destiny to explain worldly phenomena, and throw out the faith in the sanctity of Brahmins and the authenticity of miracles. This is a conspicuous mark of his modernity, especially in view of the number of sthalapuranams pretending to explain the origin of each community and temple. Beyond that he does not attempt to explain the baffling peculiarities of the country's customs and manners either by reference to the laws of economy and polity or the influence of geographical features on the inherent virtues of a creed or nation.

Padmanabha Menon was singularly unfortunate in one respect. It was in the years which immediately followed his death that several new lines of enquiry and research were opened at the same time. As Professor K. P. Pillai observed, "it was after Sri K. P. P. Menon finished the *History of Kerala* that almost all the records of Kerala history before the advent of the Portuguese were discovered."[21] Linguists like K. N. Sivaraya Pillai, M. Raghava Ayyengar and S. Yaiyapuri Pillai unearthed and studied the ancient Sangam Tamil works, about one-third of which had a direct bearing on the history of Kerala. Epigraphists in Malabar, Cochin and Travancore were busy discovering, deciphering and interpreting new inscriptions. History was literally being made in this field by Gopinatha Rao, Subramania Ayyar, Ramanatha Ayyar, Anujan Achan, K. R. Pisharodi, A. G. Warrier, V. K. R. Menon, Professor Elamkulam and others. Attoor, Ulloor, Dr. Achuta Menon, and Professor Elamkulam brought out commentaries and studies of the Sanskrit and Manipravala works and folk-songs of the mediaeval period. For about a quarter of a century there was not much progress in history writing as such in Kerala except in regard to the modern period in which the original studies of Sardar K. M. Panikkar, Dr. P. I. Poonen and others about the Portuguese and the Dutch activities made a big difference. And history writing especially about the earlier ages became more difficult because of the need for a new synthesis, assimilating all this bulk of evidence. For the

time being Padmanabha Menon's works retained their hold on lay readers and continued to be quoted in books, but historians turned in other directions.

Professor Elamkulam P. N. Kunhan Pillai of the Malayalam department of the University College, Trivandrum, has made the greatest single contribution to Kerala history since the time of Padmanabha Menon. He revolutionised the study of the subject and still dominates the field today. By taking into account all available evidence he did a quarter of a century later what Menon did in his time with evidence up-to-date. While Professor Elamkulam was mostly using new sources, he was inspired by Menon's example. He makes clear his admiration for two among his predecessors —Sardar Panikkar and Padmanabha Menon. Of the two, Panikkar had chosen a bigger canvas and themes of greater magnitude and even in his writings on Kerala history his original work was confined to modern times. Menon's field included the ancient and mediaeval history of Kerala which Professor Pillai chose for special attention.

In fact, Menon provided the starting-point for Professor Pillai. When Kerala history was introduced as a subject for study for Malayalam M.A. students and Professor Pillai was asked to teach it, he started using Padmanabha Menon as his text and rearranged the material in chronological order. Several big gaps in this history posed a challenge. Menon's forthright criticism of tradition had taught him the need to look for alternative sources. Then he set out to fill the gaps with the help of the newly published sources.[22] Though he had no formal training in the study of history the discipline imparted by Logan and Padmanabha Menon was found extremely valuable. He succeeded to a large extent in the undertaking so that Kerala history has now changed beyond recognition.

While almost all of Menon's conclusions regarding early history have become irrelevant today we may note that in regard to the study of the origin of Marumakkathayam or matriliny—a problem of central importance to the history of Kerala—Menon's bold new thesis about its late origin is borne out by the findings of Professor Pillai. In fact, Menon supplied the clue to Professor Pillai in stressing the distinction between tribal matriarchy and matriarchal relations in civilized society. Most early writers had taken for granted that matriliny in Kerala was a remnant of tribal culture. Menon found this incompatible with the picture of an enlightened society in mediaeval Kerala. He noted that Jordanus in the thirteenth century was the first foreign traveller to draw attention to the peculiarity in Malabar laws of succession. He speculated that matriliny might have replaced patrilineal succession at some later stage of social development under special circumstances and asserted that at any rate the custom gained general acceptance only by about the fifteenth century of the Christian era. At first Professor Pillai was quite sceptical about this view, but his further researches confirmed Menon's opinion though he

shifted the date of general recognition backward by two centuries.[23] Professor Pillai's theory that the wars of the eleventh century and the feudal anarchy which followed changed the laws of inheritance, cannot find general support but it is an improvement upon earlier hypothesis and, for our purpose here, it reveals an important aspect of Mr. Menon's influence.

REFERENCES

1. Vide Address presented to him in 1899 by the prominent citizens of Cochin including Dewan Govinda Menon and Paliyath Achan, the premier noble of the state.
2. T. K. Krishna Menon, Foreword to *History of Kerala*, p. xvii.
3. *Ibid.*, p. xvi.
4. Vide Address presented to him in 1917, on the occasion of his 'Shashtiabdapoorthi' by the Ernakulam Bar Association.
5. T. K. Krishna Menon, *op. cit.*, p. xix.
6. The committee consisted of the following members: (i) A. Govinda Pillai, B.A.,B.L., Puisne Judge, High Court (President); (ii) K. Krishna Pillai, B.A., Rtd. District Judge; (iii) K. P. Padmanabha Menon, B.A., B.L. of Ernakulam; (iv) K. Krishnan Pandalai, B.A., B.L. of Quilon; and (v) N. Raman Pillai, B.A., Director of Registration (Secretary).
7. Vide enclosure B of the Marumakkathayam Committee Report of 28 August, 1908.
8. *History of Cochin* (Mal.), vol. I, pp. 16-24.
9. Elamkulam P. N. Kunhan Pillai, *Cila Kerala Caritra Prasangal*, Part I, pp. 9-10.
10. *History of Cochin*, p. 26.
11. This will be clear from a survey of the chapter headings in the first volume: 1. Geography and History of Kerala; 2. Cochin Royal Family; 3. Ancient Polity; 4. Nayar Militia and Some Ancient Customs; 5. Nayar Military Strategy and Weapons; 6. Chera and Kerala; 7. Ancient Social Conditions; 8. Caste and Religion; 9. Temples —Their Origin and Administration; and 10. Further Remarks on Religions and Rituals.
12. *Ibid.*, chapter 22, pp. 457-69.
13. *Ibid.*, chapters 1 and 22.
14. *Ibid.*, chapter 24, pp. 522-23.
15. T. K. Krishna Menon, *op. cit.*, pp. xix, xx.
16. Prof. K. V. Krishna Ayyar, *Zamorins of Calicut*, p. 318.
17. Prof. P. K. S. Raja, *Mediaeval Kerala*, Preface, p. v.
18. Kanippayyur, *Aryanmarude Kudivettam Keralathil*, Part IV, Introduction, p. 8.
19. See his treatment of conflicting opinions expressed by mediaeval foreign travellers on Kerala society and his discussion of Keralolpathi tradition regarding the creation of Kerala. *History of Cochin* (Mal.), vol. I, pp. 457-69; *History of Kerala*, vol. I, pp. 22, 37.
20. Logan, *Malabar*, vol. I, Preface, p. vii: "A people who throughout a thousand and more years have been looking longingly back to an event like the departure of Ceraman Perumal for Mecca, and whose rulers even now assume the sword or sceptre on the understanding that they merely hold it 'until the uncle who has gone

to Mecca returns' might be a people whose history presents few landmarks or stepping stones, so to speak, a people whose history was almost completed on the day when that wonderful civil constitution was organised which endured through so many centuries. The Malayalee race has produced no historians simply because there was very little or no history in one sense of the word."

21. Elamkulam, *Kerala Caritrahile Iruladanja Edukal*, Introduction, p. 29.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
23. Elamkulam, *Bhashayum Sahityavum Noorrandukalil*, p. 158.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

P. S. S. PISSURLENCAR

DR. B. S. SHASTRY

(Centre of Post-Graduate Research, Panaji, Goa)

"You are doing capital work in filling up, with your researches, a corner of Indian history in which you are sole emperor," wrote Sir Jadunath Sarkar referring to one of P. S. S. Pissurlencar's papers based on Portuguese sources.[1] Indeed the soundness of Pissurlencar's knowledge of Portuguese documents bearing on Indian history was unique. The Historical Archives of Goa, which is a mine of Portuguese documents, was open to him for more than forty years. He studied the documents with devotion and assiduousness. His researches brought to light much that was new in certain areas of Indian history which were hidden from the view of historians until then. To quote Sarkar again: "One large branch of Deccan History, which was almost unknown before Cavaleiro Pandurang S. Pissurlencar of Goa devoted himself to its exploration and publication, is the Portuguese relations with the Maratha State and its Muslim predecessors (the Sultanates of Ahmadnagar and Bijapur) and the social and religious condition of the Maratha race living in Goa territory. Here a new world has been opened to our gaze by this scholar whose tireless industry and accurate learning have amplified the field of our knowledge almost beyond belief."[2] Sarkar wrote these lines in 1938. But thereafter Pissurlencar widened the field of his study further. As a result, the utility of his work extended to the whole of India and beyond.

Pandurang Sakharam Shenvi Pissurlencar was born on 30 May, 1894, in Pissurlem, a village in Satari taluka of Goa. Sakharam and Krishnabai were his parents. They had a modest income from some landed property which they owned in Pissurlem. A few years after the boy was born the family moved to Sanquelim, about four miles north-west of Pissurlem, in Bicholim taluka. There Pissurlencar received primary education in Marathi. Later he joined the Lyceum at Panaji and completed secondary education in 1913 in Portuguese medium. He then took a three-year course in teachers' training which he completed in 1916 through the "Escola Normal". He passed the law examination in 1920. His father desired that he should take to the profession of law which he considered lucrative. However, the scholar in Pissurlencar had already led him to become a teacher in 1916 in a primary school at Bicholim. He remained a primary school teacher for more than a decade. He taught Portuguese and arithmetic at different schools in Valpoi, Sanquelim, Old Goa and Nerul.[3]

Pissurlencar was married in 1913 when he was nineteen years old. His wife, Ramabai, was the daughter of Vishnu Borkar of Bicholim. The couple had one child, a daughter, by name Lilavati. Mrs. Pissurlencar died in 1963.

Pissurlencar was proficient in Portuguese, Konkani, Sanskrit and Marathi. He knew the *Modi* script well. His knowledge of English and French was also considerable. He had studied them at the Lyceum as additional languages. His ability to make use of several Indian and European languages stood him in good stead in his task as a scholar and historian. But he produced most of his valuable works either in Portuguese or in Marathi.[4]

From 1919 onwards he was allowed to consult State Papers at the secretariat in Panaji. He made good use of these documents. With their help he produced several valuable and learned papers within eleven years. Thus he established for himself a reputation as a scholar by 1930. This led to his appointment early in 1931 as the chief of the department of the 'General and Historical Archives of Portuguese India' in Panaji. Pissurlencar retired from this position on 3 May, 1961.

As the chief or director of the Archives, Pissurlencar found a herculean task before him. There were thousands of State Papers dumped in one of the rooms of the secretariat. They had been utterly neglected before. Naturally they were in disorder. Many of them were worm-eaten. The writing on several of them had started fading away as they were exposed to dampness. Pissurlencar, a passionate lover of historical documents, immediately went to their rescue. He went through them patiently, sorted them out, classified and codified them subjectwise, and got them mended and bound. By 1935 he got them removed to the present premises at Fontainhas on the outskirts of Panaji.

It is interesting to note that Pissurlencar sought and received advice and guidance from Surendranath Sen in organising the Archives. Sen was then Honorary Assistant Adviser on Records to the Government of Bengal. He had visited the Goa Archives in 1925 and was well aware of the "deplorable state in which the Goa records were."[5] But C. R. Boxer, who visited the Archives in 1952, wrote that the documents were "kept in locked cabinets with glass doors reaching to the ceiling. Dr. Pissurlencar rightly boasts that not a fragment of paper left the archives since he took charge in 1931; and although the scrupulous care with which he has collected, collated, and bound the documents has led to the binding and preservation of many fragments and of leaves which are quite illegible, this is a fault on the right side. The student may rest assured that nothing has been discarded on the ground that it was wholly or partly unreadable."[6] Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that Pissurlencar is the father of the present Historical Archives of Goa and that the Archives is one of the invaluable contributions made by him to the world of historical scholarship.

He published two guides to enable visiting scholars to trace the required documents easily.[7]

After the liberation of Goa from the Portuguese rule on 19 December, 1961, Pissurlencar started taking active interest in the development of higher education in Goa. In 1964 he donated his valuable collection of books, manuscripts, microfilms and photostat copies, more than 4,000 items in all, to the University of Bombay. In the following year the University established a Centre of Historical Research at Panaji out of this collection. Pissurlencar was appointed its director and was made an honorary professor of History. He was also recognised as a research guide for History. Several students started working under him. One of them completed his thesis successfully for the degree of Ph.D.[8] before Pissurlencar's death on 10 July, 1969, after a prolonged suffering of nearly two years on account of cancer.

A number of awards and honours were showered on Pissurlencar during his lifetime in recognition of his services as a scholar and historian. The first statutory authority to recognise the value of his work was the Government of Portugal. In 1935 it made him the 'Knight of the Military Order of Santiago'. This honour was repeated in 1952 when he was elevated to be the 'Knight-Officer' of the same order. In 1948 the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal honoured him with the Sir Jadunath Sarkar Gold Medal for Medieval Indian History. The Asiatic Society of Bombay followed suit in 1953 by awarding him the Campbell Memorial Gold Medal for his work on the same period of Indian History. The University of Lisbon awarded him the honorary degree of D.Litt. in 1956. The Brihan Maharashtra Mandal gave him its Gold Medal in 1969 in recognition of his research work in Indian History.

Pissurlencar's early interest was in Ancient India. He produced two books on the subject. The first, *A Antiqa India e O Mundo Externo* (Ancient India and the External World), came out in 1922. It was a short study of India's relations with other countries in Asia and with Europe, Africa and America from ancient times to the twelfth century of the Christian era. The second work, *Aspectos da Civilizaçao da India Antiqa* (Aspects of Ancient Indian Civilization), was published in 1925. In it Pissurlencar discussed literature, science, arts and crafts, government, religion and education in Ancient India.

Both of these works on Ancient India were based on secondary sources. Pissurlencar did not lay claim to any originality. He relied on the works of others, but scrupulously acknowledged the authorities from whom he had borrowed. The works, however, clearly exhibited his ability to make use of several European and Indian languages and to marshal facts and arguments in support of his conclusions. For example, the way in which he has maintained in the first book that Ancient Indians discovered America

is remarkable.[9] The two works on Ancient India served one important purpose: the Portuguese-speaking parts of the world—Portugal, Brazil and other Portuguese colonies—were made aware of some aspects of Ancient Indian history and culture.

In the meantime, Pissurlencar had begun to take interest in Portuguese sources bearing on Indian history, particularly on Portuguese -Maratha relations. From 1925 onwards he devoted himself, almost exclusively, to the study of Portuguese documents at the Historical Archives of Goa and to the publication of the results of his study of them. It may be pointed out here that Sir Jadunath Sarkar was greatly responsible for this. Reviewing *Aspectos da Civilizaçao da India Antiqa*, Sarkar rightly found that Pissurlencar's work on Ancient India contributed nothing new and that he was practically wasting his abilities. The elder historian felt that Pissurlencar could employ his talents more fruitfully in studying Portuguese documents. As a senior, sympathetic scholar and historian, Sarkar advised him to apply his mind to Portuguese documents.[10] Pissurlencar accepted the advice, studied Portuguese sources devotedly, and published from time to time the results of his researches. In this way, he came to be an outstanding authority on Portuguese documents.

To begin with, Pissurlencar started publishing papers and monographs in local journals. His major work was published in a series of volumes in 1950's and 1960's. *Regimentos das Fortalezas da India* (Instructions or Ordinances for the Fortresses of India) was published in 1951. Almost all the documents included in this work belong to the second half of the sixteenth century. However, there are half a dozen documents dated in the years of the first decade of the seventeenth century. The work begins with the Instruction prepared in 1576 by the Inspector of Public Finances, Diogo Velho. The Instruction laid down the rules and regulations by which the collection and expenses of the revenues were to be governed in Goa where Diogo held his office. Then follow various Instructions issued by different Governors and Viceroys for the fortresses of Ormuz, Sofala, Mosambique, Cochin, Cranganor, Quilon, Malacca, Diu, Bassein, Mombasa, Manar, Daman, Kundapur (Basrur), the Moluccas, Mangalore, Honavar, Ceylon and Chaul. There are, in the book, a few Royal Ordinances as well.

The work is extremely valuable as source-material for the study of the financial and commercial policies of the Portuguese in India and elsewhere in the latter half of the sixteenth century when the Portuguese power in the East was at its zenith. The documents include statements of income and expenditure, policy statements insisting on balanced budget, and details about the financial conditions at various Portuguese-held fortresses in India and elsewhere. A study of the economic history of Portuguese India will not, therefore, be complete without a study of these documents.

The *Regimentos* are equally valuable for an understanding of the administrative system of the Portuguese fortresses, as the officers, both civil and military, their powers and functions, and their salaries are indicated therein. So also the documents throw much light on the religious policy of the Portuguese and the organisation of their army.

Pissurlencar has reproduced the documents with accuracy. He has enhanced their value by adding well-documented footnotes at appropriate places to trace the history of the fortresses acquired by the Portuguese.

Agentes da Diplomacia Portuguesa na India (Agents of Portuguese Diplomacy in India) was the next important work brought out by Pissurlencar in 1952. In this volume he discusses the services rendered to the Portuguese by their Hindu, Muslim, Jewish and Parsi agents of Diplomacy in India in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A well-documented life-sketch of each agent and an equally well-documented account of his career are followed by the textual reproduction of Portuguese documents concerning him. Most of these documents were secured by Pissurlencar from the Historical Archives of Goa. Some came from the private collections in the possession of the descendants of some of the agents. A few were obtained from the various archives and libraries in Portugal and England.[11] The work is invaluable as source-material for the study of Portuguese relations with the neighbouring powers like the Adil Shahi kingdom of Bijapur, the Vijayanagara empire, the Nizam Shahi kingdom of Ahmadnagar, the Mughals and the Marathas. Pissurlencar, with his usual carefulness and patience, has reproduced the documents without omissions.

Assentos do Conselho do Estado (Proceedings or Minutes of the Council of State) was produced in five volumes between 1953 and 1957.[12] As the title shows, this series contains minutes of the meetings of the Council of State. The latter was an advisory body to the Governor or Viceroy of Goa. Each minute mentions the members present, the issues placed before them by the Governor or Viceroy, the opinions expressed by the members on such issues, and the opinion or decision of the Governor or Viceroy on the issues. Many a time the minutes include summaries of the relevant papers, such as letters and reports. The minutes published in the five volumes pertain to the period from 1618 and 1750. They form a veritable treasure house of information on Portuguese policy during the period. They relate not only to Portuguese affairs in India but also in Africa, the Middle East, Ceylon, Malacca and the Moluccas. They throw much light on political, religious and commercial relations of the Portuguese with other powers in Africa and Asia. The volumes, therefore, constitute an indispensable reference work for a historian of these continents in the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries.

Pissurlencar has edited the documents meticulously. The reproduction is faithful to the original. There is no case of misreading. He has given frequent notes to explain obscure points in the documents or to trace

the history of a particular event referred to in the documents or to give further reading references on the subject matter of a document. He has also published a number of supplementary documents, such as official letters and reports as appendices to each volume in order to fill up the gaps left by the minutes. He obtained most of these supplementary documents after a thorough search for them in the Historical Archives of Goa and some in the archives of Portugal. He secured a few from the National Library of Paris as well. He thus made a successful attempt to present events in their completeness wherever possible. One who is familiar with the documents preserved at the Historical Archives at Goa will be amazed, on going through the five volumes of the *Assentos*, by the thoroughness of the study made by Pissurlencar. It is evident that he had gone through practically every volume of documents at the Archives and that no important paper which was relevant to the *Assentos* escaped his attention.

He was not the first scholar to edit and publish documents from the Historical Archives of Goa. J. H. da Cunha Rivara[13] and A. B. de Bragança Pereira[14] had done it earlier. But the work of Pissurlencar is certainly better. Cunha Rivara and Bragança Pereira were arbitrary in selecting the documents for publication. The former published many of the documents in summary only. Neither of them cared to explain obscurities in the selected documents or to substantiate events referred to in them. Further, the work of Bragança Pereira "has been compiled, edited, and printed so carelessly that its numerous omissions, misreadings, and misprints render it in many ways more of a hindrance than a help."[15] None of these drawbacks and shortcomings are present in the work of Pissurlencar.

In March, 1964, Pissurlencar delivered a series of seven lectures in Marathi at the University of Poona. They were on Portuguese-Maratha relations and were delivered under the auspices of the "N. C. Kelkar Memorial Lecture Series". The University published them in 1967.[16] As the sub-title of the book indicates, Pissurlencar based the work on original Portuguese and Marathi sources available in the Historical Archives of Goa. Of course, he had already published in Portuguese a series of short works on Portuguese-Maratha relations and allied topics. These earlier works were made use of by renowned historians like Sir Jadunath Sarkar, G. S. Sardesai, Surendranath Sen and N. K. Sinha. The Marathi work is the embodiment of Pissurlencar's rich research experience and scholarship. It is the fruit of his fifty years of study of Portuguese and Marathi documents bearing on Portuguese-Maratha relations. It is indeed a unique and original contribution to the study of Modern India.

The first lecture opens with a brief account of the territorial acquisitions and losses of the Portuguese in India from 1510 to 1780. Then follows a comprehensive but critical appreciation of Portuguese sources, both published and unpublished, on Indian history in general and Portuguese -Maratha relations in particular. The second and the third lectures narrate

the Portuguese-Maratha relations during the days of Shahaji, Shivaji, Sambhaji, Rajaram and Tarabai. The next three lectures concern themselves with the period from 1707 to 1800 when Balaji Vishwanath, Baji Rao, Balaji Baji Rao, Madhav Rao, Narayan Rao, Raghunath Rao and Nana Phadnavis were at the helm of the Maratha affairs. Lectures 2-6 are mainly on political relations between the Portuguese and the Marathas. Religious and commercial issues in their relations are referred to only incidentally. In the seventh and concluding lecture miscellaneous issues like the sale of arms and ammunition to the Marathas by the Portuguese, employment of Portuguese soldiers and officers by the Marathas, exchange of envoys, dispatch of Portuguese medical doctors to Maratha leaders to cure the latter's illnesses, and the commercial articles supplied by the Portuguese to the Marathas are dealt with.

Long before 1967 Pissurlencar had published a series of six short works in Portuguese on Portuguese-Maratha relations in the pages of the *Boletim do Instituto Vasco da Gama*.[17] The title of the series was 'Portuguese e Maratas' (The Portuguese and the Marathas). The first of the series on Shivaji appeared in 1926 and at once attracted admiring attention of historians. Coming as it did immediately after Sarkar's criticism of *Aspectos da Civilizaçao da India Antiqa, Shivaji* made Sarkar say: "Here is an enduring addition to our country's history, and this is the kind of work to which I have publicly invited you."[18] The second of the series was on Sambhaji, followed by those on Rajaram, Loss of Bassein, Restoration of Bardes and Salsette, and Attempts at the Reconquest of the Northern Province. The whole of the series was based on Portuguese material and contributed much that was new to the existing historical knowledge.

Another series of seven short works by Pissurlencar was the 'Antiqualhas' (Antiquities) published with effect from 1938 in the *Boletim do Instituto Vasco da Gama*.[19] The Antiqualhas brought to light a large number of original and valuable Portuguese documents on a variety of interesting subjects: (a) The last Protuguese embassies to the Mughal court during the first three decades of the eighteenth century; (b) The siege of Parenda by the Mughals in 1634; (c) Disrespect towards the Viceroy, Conde de Linhares; (d) The origin of the Chauth; (e) The Portuguese embassy to Raigad in 1684; (f) Shivaji in the Konkan; and (g) Material for the life and deeds of Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan of Mysore. Documents in the last topic numbered 117. They were utilized by N. K. Sinha in his work on Hyder Ali.[20]

In addition to the above works Pissurlencar wrote a large number of papers of considerable research value in Portuguese as well as Marathi. Space does not permit a discussion of all of them and their significance. Nevertheless, the most important of them are briefly noted here.

A Antiquidade do Crisnaismo[21] (Antiquity of Krishna-ism) was intended to show that the cult of Krishna was prior to Christianity. It was in reply

to A. Labato de Faria who maintained the opposite view. *Xivaji Maharaja com Sanque Portugues?*[22] (Shivaji Maharaja with Portuguese Blood?) incontrovertibly proved that Shivaji had no Portuguese blood in his veins. Cosme da Guarda had written a book on Shivaji in which the author stated that "people were not wanting who said" that Shivaji was an illegitimate son of Jijabai by a Portuguese gentleman of Virar near Bassein, Dom Manoel de Menezes.[23] As his statement implies, Guarda mentioned what was only a rumour. He added: "May truth prevail." But Gerson da Cunha and J. J. Fragoso believed Guarda's statement as a fact, tried to confirm it with their own arguments, and thus set afoot a controversy. Pissurlencar silenced them.[24] Sir Jadunath Sarkar wrote that Pissurlencar's was a "very closely-reasoned and scholarly work" and that he had "consulted practically all the sources on the subject and left no argument unemployed." Sarkar, who was well versed in Persian, French, English and other sources on Shivaji, agreed with Pissurlencar's conclusion and said that none of the sources, not even the hostile Muslim sources, made "the least suggestion about his not having been of pure Hindu descent."[25]

Pissurlencar's researches into the history of Goa before the advent of the Portuguese resulted in discovering a number of inscriptions, monuments and other archaeological remains. He published several papers on pre-Portuguese Goa.[26] Referring to one of them, "Goa Ha 1500 Anos" (Goa 1500 Years Ago), Sarkar wrote: "These discoveries are a revelation to men who had given up any hope of finding Hindu antiquities in Goa territory, except at a heavy expenditure in excavation. But one energetic man is worth more than thousands of Rupees."[27]

From what has been said above in respect of his academic career it is evident that Pissurlencar had no formal higher education. Nor did he have any formal training in historiography. He was a self-made scholar and historian. However, there was one great son of India who influenced Pissurlencar considerably in his illustrious career. It was Sir Jadunath Sarkar who acted as a friend, philosopher and guide to him. Sarkar admired his industry and accurate learning. He showered praise on Pissurlencar; but at the same time he did not hesitate to criticise the Goan scholar severely for his lack of originality and his erroneous methodology. On one occasion Sarkar advised him that he "should not refer to translations where the original text is available," and that he "should discriminate between the authorities, by rejecting the earlier writers altogether, as the latest authority is usually the only authority."[28] This he said while praising Pissurlencar's paper on 'Xivaji Maharaja com Sanque Portugues?' We have seen how critical he was of Pissurlencar's *Aspectos da Civilizaçao da India Antiqa* for its lack of originality. Pissurlencar, who knew the value of the advice and guidance of so well-known and established a historian, used to welcome and accept them. The two learned men became life-long

friends after 1920. They helped each other in their task as scholars and historians. Sarkar used to assist Pissurlencar in improving his papers in English which were presented at the meetings of the Indian Historical Records Commission. In 1954 Pissurlencar requested Sarkar to send him some material from Bengali literature on certain topics. Sarkar readily obliged.[29] On his part, Pissurlencar kept on sending new material from the Historical Archives of Goa as and when Sarkar needed it. And the latter acknowledged this service in a letter dated the 13 July, 1953: "Today I have received your packet of extracts from records pp. 1-10. Thanks for the inestimable help which I have been getting from you ever since 1920, when the second edition of my *Shivaji* was published."[30]

Another scholar from whom Pissurlencar drew inspiration was V. K. Rajwade who was the pioneer researcher in Marathi documents for the history of the Marathas. Pissurlencar admired the tireless devotion with which Rajwade worked. With veneration he used to recollect how Rajwade would take a *laddu* with him and eat it bit by bit whenever he felt hungry while he was engrossed in the study of documents throughout the day.[31]

Pissurlencar was both a scholar and a historian. As a scholar, he edited and published original documents. As a historian, he interpreted such original documents and correlated the facts found in them in order to arrive at conclusions on historical events. Of course, a major part of his work consists of the scholarly type.[32] But there are a few of his works which cannot but be regarded as the work of a historian.[33] In both capacities his contribution to the world's stock of historical knowledge is invaluable. His contribution has certainly secured for him a place of honour among scholarly historians.

REFERENCES

The following abbreviations are used in the ensuing notes:

BIVG: Boletim do Instituto Vasco da Gama, Goa.
CHR: Centre of Historical Research, Goa.
IHRC: Indian Historical Records Commission.
OP: O Oriente Portugues, Goa.
PPSS: Pandurang S. S. Pissurlencar.
SSJ: Sir Jadunath Sarkar.

1. SSJ to PPSS, 10.7.1928, mss at CHR.
2. SSJ in the *Proceedings of the IHRC*, vol. xiv, Simla, 1938, p. 91.

3. I consulted several books and newspapers for the details of Pissurlencar's birth, education, family, career and titles. But, these publications were not entirely reliable, particularly the newspapers, with the exception of a few. There were conflicting details, erroneous dates and mistaken facts. The result was confusion. Nevertheless, my own contacts with Professor Pissurlencar as his student for the Ph.D. degree came to my rescue. So also two gentlemen, A. R. S. Dhume, a retired revenue official and a nephew of Pissurlencar, and R. P. Karmali, well versed in the history of education in Goa, helped me to verify the accuracy of the details. The following are some of the publications which I consulted: (i) *Who is Who in India, Burma and Ceylon*, Bombay, 1942; (ii) *Biographical Encyclopaedia of the World*, 3rd edition, Institute for Research in Biography, New York, 1946; (iii) *Gomantaka*, a Marathi daily, Goa; the issues dated 13.8.1967, 31.5.1968 and 11.7.1969; (iv) *Lokasatta*, a Marathi daily, Poona; the issues dated 30.5.1965, 12.2.1967, 7.4.1967 and 11.7.1969; (v) *Maharashtra Times*, a Marathi daily, Poona; the issues dated 1.3.1969 and 11.7.1969; (vi) *The Navhind Times*, an English daily, Goa; the issues dated 30.6.1965, 2.6.1968 and 11.7.1969; (vii) *O Heraldo*, a Portuguese daily, Goa; the issues dated 30.4.1958 and 6.11.1965; and (viii) *Diario da Noite*, a Portuguese daily, Goa; the issues dated 15.6.1920, 14.4.1921, 25.8.1923, 5.5.1959 and 5.5.1961.
4. There are nine papers in English and two in French by him. However, these are mostly translations of his Portuguese works and not original compositions in English. The papers are: (i) "The Attitude of the Portuguese towards Shivaji during the campaigns of Shaista Khan and Jai Singh", read at the ninth meeting of the IHRC, Calcutta, 1927; (ii) "Shivaji and the Portuguese", *Shivaji Souvenir*, Bombay, 1927; (iii) "Prince Akbar and the Portuguese", read at the tenth meeting of the IHRC, Calcutta, 1928; (iv) "Some Unknown Dealings between Raghoba and the Portuguese", read at the eleventh meeting of the IHRC, Calcutta, 1929; (v) "Portuguese Records on Rustom Manockji", tr. by S. B. D'Silva, Nova Goa, 1936; (vi) "Rajaram and the Portuguese", Calcutta, 1930; (vii) "The Extinction of the Nizamshahi", in *Sardesai Commemoration Volume*, Bombay, 1938; (viii) "A Portuguese Embassy to Raigad in 1684", in the *Proceedings of the All-India Modern History Congress*, Poona, 1936; (ix) "Some Notes on a Conflict between Khanoji Angria and the English of Bombay", *Proceedings of the IHRC*, New Delhi, 1943; (x) "Recherches sur la Découverte de L'Amerique par les Anciens Hommes de L'Inde", Sanquelim, Goa, 1920; and (xi) "Contribution a L'Etude de L'Histoire de la Medicine Portugaise dans L'Inde", Nova Goa, 1927.
5. Sen, S. N. to PPSS, 1.7.1930 and 28.6.1934, mss at CHR.
6. Boxer, C. R., "A Glimpse of the Goa Archives", *BSOAS*, 1952, xiv/2, p. 300.
7. The first one is *Roteiro do Cartorio Geral do Estado da India*, Lisbon, 1951. It merely gives the number of volumes under each head of subject matter and the year or the period to which they belong. The second one is *Roteiro dos Arquivos da India Portuguesa*, Bastora, Goa, 1955. This is more comprehensive. The code number, title and year or period of each volume under each head are given. Besides, some of the documents are summarised in it. The list mentions documents kept not only at the Historical Archives of Goa at Panaji but also those that are preserved in various other archives in Goa and Daman.
8. It is the author of this paper.
9. PPSS, *A Antiqa India e O Mundo Externo*, pp. 155 ff.
10. *Modern Review*, July, 1925, pp. 29-31. I am grateful to Professor G. M. Moraes who gave me his notes in this connection.
11. Pissurlencar was in Europe in 1950, 1954 and 1959-60.
12. PPSS, *Assentos do Conselho do Estado*, vol. I (1618-33), Goa, 1953; vol. II (1634-43), Goa, 1953; vol. III (1644-58), Goa, 1955; vol. IV (1659-95), Goa, 1956; and vol. V (1696-1750), Goa, 1957.

13. Rivara, J. H. da Cunha, *Archivo Portuguez Oriental*, 11 vols., Nova Goa, 1857-76.
14. Pereira, A. B. de Bragança, *Arquivo Portugues Oriental*, 10 vols., Nova Goa, 1936-40.
15. Boxer, C. R., *art. cit.*, p. 299.
16. PPSS, *Portugese-Marathe Samvandha: Arthat Portugesamchya Dapatamtil Marathayamcha Itihas* (Portuguese-Maratha Relations or History of the Marathas based on Portuguese Archives), Poona, 1967.
17. *BIVG*, no. 1, 1926; nos. 2-4, 1928; no. 6, 1929; no. 9, 1931; nos. 10-13, 1932; nos. 17-18, 1933; and no. 47, 1940.
18. SSJ to PPSS, 1.5.1926, mss at CHR.
19. *BIVG*, no. 38, 1938; no. 42, 1939; no. 45, 1940; no. 51, 1941; nos. 54-55, 1942.
20. Sinha, N. K., *Haidar Ali*, Calcutta, 1949, pp. ii. 144 ff., 295-96.
21. Published in OP, 1920.
22. A short work of 40 pages published at Sanquelim, Goa, 1922.
23. Guarda, Cosme da: *Vida e Acçoes do Famoso e Felicissimo Sevagy*, Lisbon, 1730, p. 1; Sen, S. N., *Foreign Biographies of Shivaji*, Calcutta, 1927, p. 1.
24. Sen, S. N., *Administrative System of the Marathas*, Calcutta, 1925, 2nd edition, pp. 12-14.
25. SSJ to PPSS, 28.1.1923, mss at CHR.
26. (i) "As Primativas Capitais de Goa", OP, no. 1, 1931; (ii) "A 'Sindabur' de Ibn Batuta", Nova Goa, 1932; (iii) "Ainda a 'Sindabur' de Ibn Batuta", Nova Goa, 1932; (iv) "O Descobrimento dum Santuario Shivaita do seculo XIV em Velha Goa", OP, no. 4, 1932; (v) "Goa Ha 1500 Anos", OP, no. 6, 1934; (vi) "Um Passo do Cronista Barros Elucidado a Luz duma Inscricao Sanscrita", OP, no. 18, 1937; (vii) "Inscriçoes Pre-Portuguesas de Goa", OP, no. 22, 1938; and (viii) "Goa Pre-Portuguesa atraves dos Escritores Lusitanos dos seculos XVI e XVII", Lisbon, 1961.
27. SSJ to PPSS, 16.11.1934, mss at CHR.
28. *Ibid.*, 28.1. 1923, mss at CHR.
29. *Ibid.*, 17.2.1954, mss at CHR.
30. Mss. at CHR.
31. Ramdas, R., "Itihas-Martand Pisurlekar", in *Lokasatta* 30.5.1965; and Barve, R. K., "Gomantkache thir Itihas Samsodhak Dr. Pandurang Sakharam Pisurlekar", in *Kesari* 22.3.1964.
32. (i) *Assentos do Conselho do Estado*, 5 vols.; (ii) *Agentes da Diplomacia Portuguesa na India;* (iii) *Regimentos das Fortalezas da India;* and (iv) *Antiqualhas.*
33. (i) *Portugese-Marathe Samvandha;* and (ii) *Portugueses e Maratas.*

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

BRITISH HISTORIANS

GRANT DUFF

DR. A. R. KULKARNI

(Deccan College, Poona)

CAPTAIN JAMES CUNNINGHAM GRANT DUFF, the first comprehensive historian of the Marathas, was born on 8 July 1789, in a Scottish family of John Grant of Kincardine O'Neill at Banff. His mother, Margaret Miln, succeeded to the estate of her brother William Duff of Braco, and was thereupon obliged to assume the name of Duff under the entail in 1824.[1] His father died in 1799, and the family shifted to Aberdeen, where he joined the Marischal College. He gave up his education and went out as a boy of sixteen to India. He was wrecked on his way near Cape St. Rogue, was all but drowned by the upsetting of a boat off the Cape of Good Hope, where he first saw shots fired in anger, and broke his arms between that place and Bombay. He accepted cadetship in the Bombay Military Service, and after successfully completing his preliminary training, secured a commission as ensign on 23 April, 1807. He was assigned to the 1st Bombay Native Infantry, also known as Bombay Grenadiers. He attracted the attention of Mount Stuart Elphinstone, the then Resident at Poona, in the year 1810, and was admitted into the band of workers (like Captain Pottinger, John Briggs, Chaplin and others) popularly known as the family of Elphinstone, in the subsequent years.

He was an active participant in the famous battle of Kirkee fought in November, 1817, along with Colonel Burr and Captain Ford of the East India Company. Though he was a subordinate officer to Colonel Burr, it appears that it was due to his sagacity and promptness that the calamity of a crushing defeat was averted.[2] This must have brought him still closer to Elphinstone than before. He thus became not only a devoted servant, but also a counsellor of Elphinstone in subsequent years.

He became captain in 1818, and was selected by Elphinstone for the office of the Political Agent of Satara, an independent State, carved out of the territories conquered from the Peshwas. His son writes that Duff "was governing the Satara State, a country equal in extent to about a third of Scotland with nearly absolute power." He was to administer the State strictly according to the instructions issued to him, and was asked to secure the support of the Raja without introducing any innovations in the State. He entered into a treaty with the Raja on 25 September, 1819, regarding the management of the transactions of the State for a specific period, and also entered into agreements with the feudatories of the Raja, separately. He was to train the Raja and his officials before handing over

the responsibility to him in 1822. He remained in that position for four years (1818-22), and after surmounting all the difficulties in his way, left the Raja "as the most civilized Maratha", and his country in an excellent order.[3]

It was here in Satara that he collected all his source-material of Maratha history and also prepared its first draft, before leaving the shores of India. His son, however, disapproved of this activity of his father which, according to him, was "but *unhappily superadded*"[4] to his ordinary work which was exceedingly heavy. The double labour ruined his health and in January 1823, he left India. Wisely or unwisely, he determined within the next year or two that he was quite unfit to return thither or indeed to take up any work of a serious kind at home.

His services as an administrator were appreciated by the people, and 'Grant Saheb' became a household word in Satara.[5] A glowing tribute has been paid to him by a British official who writes, "...at 25 years of age, with no previous training [he] was set to govern a kingdom with absolute power, and who did govern it so wisely and firmly that he literally changed a wilderness into a fruitful land."[6]

After his mother's death in 1824 he succeeded to the Duff's estate. He married in 1825[7] Jane Catherine, the charming daughter of Sir Whitelaw Ainslie, the author of the *Materia Medica of India*, and settled down at Eden, devoting himself partly to field sports, but chiefly to improving his property according to his lights. He got some estate from his wife's side also, and thus became James Cunningham Grant Duff in 1850.

He spent the rest of his life as a country gentleman, devoting most of his time to agriculture, cattle-breeding and planting. He had acquired some practical knowledge of farming, and bought some "miserable working land" in addition to what he had inherited.[8] He loved touring. In his lengthy letters to Elphinstone he wrote about his sojourns on the continent and discussed contemporary politics. He was feeling weak in 1852, as he writes, "I am afraid, I may not very long pursue my bodily activity."[9] He died six years later on 23 September, 1858.

Grant's wife was a very domineering type of woman. His son also did not hold good opinion about him though he owed his eminent position to the good offices of his father. Grant Duff left behind him two sons and one daughter, Alice Jane. His first son, Mount Stuart Elphinstone Grant Duff, held responsible positions under the Company and the Crown. His second son, Ainslie Douglas Ainslie, adopted the surname of his mother in lieu of Grant Duff.

Grant evinced a great interest in the Raja of Satara even after his retirement. He wrote to the Raja in 1828, "Administer justice impartially, assess your lands lightly, and make the Resident your friend by your good conduct."[10] The Raja too often expressed his deep gratitude towards him. Grant did not like the British policy of deposing the Raja in 1839, and

the final annexation of the state in 1848. He held the view that the British statesmen must not be swayed by any consideration except simple, straightforward honesty.

Duff's *History of the Marathas* was his only contribution to historical writing. He did not even revise it, or publish its second edition. He worked on his draft in the light of the suggestions made by his friends, and requested John Murray and Company to undertake its publication. He writes, "...the whole will be comprised in two moderate sized quartos of not more than 200,000 words in each volume."[11]

Murray consulted some experts and told Duff that he would publish the latter's work, provided he would alter its title as "the Downfall of the Mughals, and the Rise of the English."[12] Grant refused to do so, and went to Sir James Mackintosh who helped him in getting his history published through Longman and Company, and in six weeks' time, the *History of the Marathas* saw the light of the world.

Elphinstone had once thought of writing a history of the Marathas. Perhaps, his *Report on the Territories Conquered from the Peshwas* (1819) might have induced him to pursue the historical part of it in more detail. But "it was a pity that official business interfered to prevent even arranging his plans."[13]

The mantle of writing Maratha history thus ultimately fell on the shoulders of Grant Duff who was unaware of the plans of Elphinstone till he expressed them in a reply to his letter in which he wrote about the "floating idea" of Maratha history.[14]

Elphinstone had asked him to keep an eye on historical material, perhaps for his own history, while discharging his duties as Political Agent at Satara. For a long time the immediate problems of the State prevented him from paying any attention to this request of the commissioner. But during the rainy season of 1819 he sat for three nights and ransacked the Archives of the Raja of Satara where he found a treasure of documents, highly useful for the history of the Marathas. He enumerated the documents dating from 1649 to 1725 including original letters from Shahjahan, Aurangzeb and his successor. the Sayed brothers, the grants to the Marathas from Muhammad Shah and the letters of the Peshwas, etc. He found certain histories from the earliest antiquity to the present times, written by Chitnis. After taking stock of the material he wrote, "...a long time ago I had a *floating idea* of throwing some light on Maratha History, the possession of such materials and some other sources of information enable me to authenticate a great deal of what immediately concerns this country."[15]

When this floating idea of Maratha history occurred to him, he was not yet sure whether he could carry it to its logical end. He was aware of

his limited equipment, and was hesitating to make his desire public. He wrote to Elphinstone, "There is as important a consideration as can occur in a man's life, and I am not asking advice after I have made up my mind. Tell me candidly if you think I ought to undertake it; if so, I should like to keep my purpose private."[16] He thought that Elphinstone would dissuade him. But that was not to be. On the next day he got an encouraging reply: "I am delighted with your progress in historical collection, and still more with your intention of putting them in order. I certainly do advise you most earnestly to do so."[17]

Thus the "floating idea" began to take shape, and before he sailed for England in January, 1823, he had practically the complete draft of his history, duly corrected by Elphinstone, William Erskine, John Briggs and Kennedy before him.

It seems that Grant Duff had issued a circular probably in 1819, in which he appealed to those who possessed *bakhars*, *kaifiyats*, copperplates, old *sanads* and *watanpatras*, *inampatras*, *hakikats* in Marathi, Persian or in Sanskrit about the rulers of North India, of the Baridshahi, Nizamshahi, and Adilshahi dynasties and of the Marathas, to hand over these documents to him.[18]

He was fortunate in getting original material from the Raja of Satara, the Chitnis family, and a number of other persons some of whom were eye-witnesses of certain events. He was aware of the difficulties experienced by his predecessors, "the indefatigable Orme" of *Fragments*, and Scot Waring of the *History of the Marathas* (1810). He confessed that "circumstances placed me in situations which at once removed many of the obstacles which those gentlemen encountered, and threw materials within my reach which had been previously inaccessible."[19]

He spared no pains in collecting, copying, and translating *bakhars* and other documents into English, for authenticating his statements. Balajipant Natu, his native assistant at Satara, was helpful to him in persuading the Raja to lend his Records to Grant Sahib, which would be printed in *Vilayat* and his name would be made known to the Europeans.[20] Yet it appears from the Raja's diary that all documents were not made over to him. The Raja had warned his officials that they should not leave any documents with the Political Agent, and that a list of all documents shown to him should be maintained.[21]

Grant's approach to the study of these documents seems to be scientific. He did not accept a document or a chronicle without challenging its authenticity. The extracts published from the Raja's diary will bear out this fact.

Grant Duff knew Marathi, but it is doubtful whether he could follow Marathi documents written in Modi script. He had acquired a number of Marathi chronicles from the Chitnis family as well as from the Deshmukhs

and Deshpandes of various villages. Whenever he refers to Marathi manuscripts in his book, it is invariably some Marathi *bakhar*. Unfortunately he does not indicate the name of the manuscript supporting the statement. This is a serious omission in his writings. At first, he considered the *Chitnis Bakhar*[22] to be "a mass of nonsense, though not despicable as it stated some important facts."[23] He told Chitnis that his *bakhar* which simply glorifies the Maratha hero, creates a suspicion in the mind of the reader.[24] Nevertheless, he has used this *bakhar* profusely, as after a year or so, the same *bakhar* appeared to him "on the whole most valuable, as it gives a good account of Sivajee's expedition into the Carnatic, but is in general defective in the early details we wish to get."[25]

He compares the Marathi *bakhars* with the Persian *Tawarikhs* and arrives at the conclusion that "the laudatory accounts of the Muslims are false in many respects. The accounts written by the Hindus are only half -truths."[26] The person who was appointed to translate the *bakhars* into English was warned that he should do so after consulting Balwantrao Parasnis and comparing them with old notes.[27] He refers to a *bakhar* in the possession of Khatao Deshpande, dealing with the history of Maharashtra from Shalivahan to Ramdev Rai. He got a copy of Shivaji's life from the Raja of Kolhapur. Probably, this is the *Sabhasad bakhar*.

However, like Scott Waring, his predecessor in this field, he was too much enamoured by the graphic accounts of the chroniclers, both Hindu and Muslim, and based his history mostly on them. It seems that Elphinstone had noticed this trend in his writing as he writes, "...get at facts and combine them with judgement so as to make a consistent and rational history out of a mass of gossiping *bakhars* and gasconading *Tawareeks*."[28]

Rajwade, the noted Maratha historian, also resented this history of Duff as nothing more than a revised edition of the *bakhars* from which it draws its chief material. When the history was translated by Captain Capen and Baba Sane into Marathi in 1829, it is surprising that its title was *Marathyanchi Bakhar*.

Besides, Duff consulted a number of original documents. When he took possession of the Archives of the Raja of Satara, in November 1818, he found copies of grants, Shivaji's letter to Ekoji, the ruler of Tanjore, Aurangzeb's letters, etc. He found the original letters of Chimnaji Appa and Brahmendra Swami at Poona, and yet complained that the Poona Dufter supplied nothing for several years after 1720.[29] He discovered that some records of the period from Sambhaji to Shahu were lost either at Raigad when taken by the Mughals or burnt when Satara was looted by Parsuram Bhau Patwardhan.[30] He did not suspect that the Raja had concealed something from him. He was convinced that they had really very little useful to show. All the papers not shown to him were mere trash.

The Marathi documents were not only difficult to translate, but the

labour involved in it, according to him, was not always worthwhile. He writes, "It is one peculiar evil of the work in which I am engaged that out of papers of ten ells long there are perhaps ten useful lines."[31]

Grant Duff was quite aware that no authentic history of the Marathas, especially its earlier portion, could be satisfactorily narrated without consulting Persian sources. He consulted Ferishta, Khafi Khan, Abul Husain Qazi's history of Bijapur, Mir Ibrahim's history of Bijapur, Nurulla's history of Ali Adil Shah the Second, Mohmud Nama by Maula Zahur, a historical poem called Ali Nama composed by Nasarat, a history of Bijapur written by Syed Moidin Pirzada in 1821, etc.[32] Ferishta and Khafi Khan were useful to him in narrating the early history of the medieval Deccan. He did not agree with Briggs, who was translating Ferishta, that his account went beyond 1596. But, as Ferishta died in 1626, one can understand Briggs's contention.[33] He attached more importance to Khafi Khan's *Muntakhab-ul-lubab*, and was anxious to procure a good copy of this manuscript. He had one imperfect copy, which he regarded as highly useful in assisting inquiries, but whose accuracy he was inclined to doubt in many particulars. About Khafi Khan he writes, "After reading the translation of Ferishta and collecting every scrap of written legend to be had in this country, I found an immense blank from the year 1600 to 1650, which Khafi Khan enables me to fill up much better than I expected."[34] Mohumud Hanif of Aurangabad had given him a good copy of Khafi Khan, and a Syed from Bijapur had told him about his authenticity, that, on the whole, he was a good historian for the Mughals but "that he is a partial writer on the side of Shahjahan, and altogether wrong in a part of what he states regarding Beejapur."[35] However, he was inclined to follow Khafi Khan's account in preference to any other, though it was unduly different from Hindu accounts in some points. According to Grant Duff, up to the time when Shivaji commenced his career, Khafi Khan must be an authority where there was no better reason to doubt him than a Marathi *Bakhar*.[36]

Muntakhab-ul-lubab was written in 1735, and it has now been rejected as an authentic source for the history of the seventeenth century. Besides this, from the authorities quoted by him, it appears that he was not aware of the existence of the *Alamgir-namah*, the *Masir-i-Alamgiri* and the *Akhbarats*.

One who reads the views of Grant Duff on the *Chitnis Bakhar* and Khafi Khan would easily follow the impact of these two secondary sources on his *History of the Marathas*.

In addition to these *Tawarikhs*, Grant could find certain Persian documents in the Raja's Archives including a few original letters of Shahjahan (1649), Aurangzeb and their successors (1656-1707), of Sayed Husain Ali Khan (1718), the three grants made by Muhammad Shah to the first Peshwa in 1719, and a number of letters from 1719 to 1725.[37]

Grant, while in the Bombay Native Infantry, acted as the Persian

interpreter of his regiment. It was perhaps his knowledge of Persian that attracted the attention of Elphinstone. It is, however, doubtful whether he was able to read Persian manuscripts. In fact, the vast amount of Persian material which he collected was creating problems for him, and his advisers were insisting on consulting the Persian sources. Elphinstone had asked him to study Muslim histories and memoirs from North India, the Hyderabad records, and the *Siyar-ul-Mutakherin*, translated by Mustafa, "which is worth its weight in gold."[38]

Briggs who read the first six chapters of his manuscript, dealing mainly with the Muslim period of the Deccan, suggested to him to revise his chapters in the light of certain Persian authorities. Duff expressed his inability to carry out his suggestion, as he was anxious to finish the writing of this work before leaving India. He wrote, "I am getting stronger in authorities, but the size is tremendous, the subject tedious, and if the labour is sickening to me, it will be appalling to the reader."[39]

It appears from the correspondence between Duff and Elphinstone that the former had not only an access to original records, but also personally collected a number of manuscripts and documents from various sources. One does not know what happened to this personal collection of Grant Duff. It was believed some time that he carried the whole of it with him, and that it unfortunately caught fire in the course of his sea-voyage. But Grant was writing regularly to Elphinstone about his journey, and nowhere does he mention any kind of mishap. Justice K. T. Telang carefully examined, but in vain, the records of the Literary Society of Bombay, as it was claimed that he deposited them there.[40] Neither the India Office Library, London, possesses it, nor the National Register of Archives, London, makes any reference to it.[41]

Among the European records Duff relied more on the English records from Bombay and Calcutta than on the French, the Dutch or the Portuguese records. He consulted the Portuguese records, while describing the siege of Bassein. He had sought confirmation of certain dates from the Viceroy of Goa. As regards the English records dealing with the Treaty of Wadgaon (1780), he writes, "...all the English transactions will require reflection, prudence, and moderate, though just, opinions."[42] Elphinstone had asked him to consult the despatches of Mostyn, Malet and Palmer, Anderson's letters from Scindia's camp, Barry Close on Baji Rao, his own letters to the Bombay and Bengal Governments giving the account of recent times, the *Asiatic Researches* for accounts of Panipat, Parliamentary Records, etc. He says further that the plots, intrigues, conspiracies, and combinations from the time of Madhav Rao's death till Bajirao's accession might be easily obtained from the Reports of Malet and Palmer.[43] He was prepared to procure copies of these records for Duff, provided the latter was prepared to pay for them. Duff gave a list of documents which he desired to

obtain from Bengal and agreed to spare Rs. 1000/- for this job.[44] He seems to be at home when dealing with the English material. It is perhaps due to this that the last part of his history gives more details than the earlier one. Rajwade says that he has disposed of the history of about 150 years in 475 pages, whereas the history of 22 years (1746-96) has occupied 200 pages. In other words, it describes the English activities in Maharashtra, in greater detail than the activities of the Marathas.[45]

Duff also consulted a number of scholars, eye-witnesses of certain events, while preparing the draft of his history. His manuscript was read by Elphinstone, William Erskine of Bombay, John Briggs, the collector of Khandesh, Vans Kennedy, the secretary of the Literary Society, Bombay, and others. He requested some of his native assistants to write accounts of certain historical events. Mention may be made here of the voluminous history of his times prepared by Balaji Pant Natu, his first native assistant at Satara.[46] When his friends delayed in supplying the necessary material he would get annoyed with them, and wrote in despair, "I expected some assistance from them, but they do not seem inclined to afford it. I shall have something less to say in the preface... I will show them, I can make something of it without their aid."[47]

The narration of the rise and fall of the Maratha Power presented a number of problems. For lack of adequate and authentic materials, it was difficult to narrate the story of the rise of the Maratha power; and secondly, the period of Shivaji and his times could not be satisfactorily described due to paucity of authentic State Papers. With the rise of the Peshwas in the eighteenth century, the scope of Maratha activities is widened and the narrative becomes much more complicated. For a full understanding of the eighteenth century Maratha history one has to study carefully the activities of the Mughals, the Nizam, the Nawabs in the South, the Rajas of Mysore, the Marathas in Malwa, Gujarat and Karnatak, the factions among the Maratha sardars, Dabhade and Gaikawad, Bhonsle and Pratinidhi, Shinde and Holkar, the Siddis, the Europeans, etc. In view of the limited time at his disposal, it was not possible for him to undertake a careful scrutiny of these problems. He was least interested in narrating these events. He says, "I am exceedingly horrified by events on events, so many characters, and so many interests, and with all so little interesting to the reader, that nothing cheers me except that *I see or fancy I see* what no one alive knows."[48] It was this idea of a pioneering work in an unknown field that prompted Grant to undertake this stupendous task. The earlier enthusiasm waned with the progress of his work. He could not keep pace with the growing material and increasing suggestions made by his friends. He gets confused and lost and says, "I cannot find out what I meant to express."[49] Elphinstone had, however, clearly defined to him the nature and scope of Maratha history. He writes, "A Maratha History

would embrace the downfall of the Mughal Empire and the rise of our own as well as that, which is its professed object to treat. It must be well thought over and then told."[50] Grant had, of course, no time for all this. Elphinstone was attracted towards Maratha history at least for one reason, that is, as he puts it to Grant, "the wholeness of your subject is one of its greatest beauties."[51]

The relation between Elphinstone and Grant was one of a supervisor and his pupil. The exchange of letters between the two throws much light on the ideas of history and research methodology prevailing in the early nineteenth century. Himself being a historian and interested in Maratha history, Elphinstone had carefully thought over the problem of presenting it. He used to go through Duff's chapters carefully and make useful suggestions (which he calls censures), regarding their improvement and additional reading. Duff regarded these suggestions as not only useful but also necessary to save him from future shame.[52] He thought that these censures gave him much stronger encouragement than he had ventured to hope.[53]

Elphinstone wanted to develop the history of the Marathas on certain specific lines. He asked Duff to introduce more of the manners of the Marathas, more to put the people and their leaders before the eyes of the reader, and to enable him to understand their motives and modes of action. He recommended to Duff the model of Bernier, the European traveller of the seventeenth century, "of mixing history and travels which is required in recording the transactions of a distant nation."[54] He cited one example from Maratha history, and said, "when you bring Shivaji and Saista Khan together, contrast in a few touches the luxurious magnificence and pride of the Mohammedan with the hardy, bold and crafty character of the half-naked Maratha."[55]

Elphinstone insisted that Duff should make his history more readable and interesting. He felt that Duff did not pay much attention to the reader, who, he took it for granted, was well acquainted with Mughal history, and able to pick up a story after frequent interruptions, or turn back, and search for the broken thread. He wrote, "You must connect causes and effects so that the relation may be seen, without appearing to explain too much or to undervalue the worthy reader's understanding."[56] He further suggested that Duff should continue his method of arranging the facts and polishing his style and alter it, if necessary, after ascertaining the public taste in Europe. He cited the example of Gibbon who wrote his first quarto seven times, and was scarcely satisfied even then.[57] He suggested that Duff should study approved authorities to avoid confusion, and show his manuscript to a literary man or a professed writer, which would enable him to meet the eye of the public, and to be sure of the manner and matter.[58] It is interesting to note that Elphinstone recommended the use of anecdotes which could not only make descriptions picturesque, but also grease the

wheels of the narrative. At the same time he warned him that all jokes and sly hits of every description should be cut out as they are unsuited to history.[59] He recommended a plain and simple style for a historian. He urged that scenes and events should be painted as they appear to a plain man and in plain language. He warned Duff, "you are ruined, if you assume a stately formal style."[60]

Elphinstone was aware of the shortcomings of Duff's work. Yet he was full of praise for the latter's efforts. He brought out the value of the proposed work in these words, "This book is excellent and satisfying curiosity on many points till unknown. All the seeds of the Maratha greatness are laid open to the complete satisfaction of the reader. I have no doubt whatever, that the Maratha history will be a valuable and even a popular work."[61] He wrote to Colonel Barry Close that it would be an excellent history; Shivaji, Sambhaji and Rajaram "now stand in full light, as simplified and intelligible as Hyder and Tipu."[62]

Grant showed his gratefulness to his teacher by deciding to dedicate his book to him. On this Elphinstone said, "I am much flattered by your proposed notice of me in your publication. I wish I saw it in print."[63] He suggested to the ship authorities by which he was sailing that in case of any mishap on his way, his baggage containing his draft history and notes be sent to Elphinstone. Grant Duff's *History of the Marathas* begins with a note of dedication and ends with profound tributes to the achievement of Elphinstone in Western India.[64]

In spite of Elphinstone's characterisation as a valuable and popular work, Grant's History was not received with enthusiasm when it was first published in 1826. It was not submitted to any principal reviews, nor were efforts made to promote its sale. Even the East India Company did not purchase the usual number of its copies. It was, in those days, mainly read by the revenue officers of the Company posted in Western India.[65]

John Briggs or Vans Kennedy who read his manuscript did not consider it as satisfactory. Elphinstone knew that his History was rich in facts, beyond all former examples and that his views were always judicious and correct.[66] Yet he did not like his treatment of the subject. He wanted Duff to imbibe the spirit behind the Maratha activity. He urged for some object behind the narration rather than a dry enumeration of facts. Justice Ranade has described the period 1689-1707 as a period of heroic resistance, a period of Maratha war of independence.[67] Grant Duff could not grasp the line of thinking, suggested by Elphinstone. He, therefore, complains, "the Marathas are such actors for the page of history and there is such a dreary sameness in the detail of the progress, of the confusion they created, that it is the total want of interest in them which makes you wish for some object on which to fix attention."[68]

When the Maratha history was published in 1826 it was not long

noticed by the critics. Mr. N. J. Kirtane, a student of the Deccan College, was the first to launch a severe criticism against Grant Duff, forty-two years after the publication of his work. He first congratulated the author for this stupendous task, and pointed out a few shortcomings in his history. His main point was that the author could not utilize fully the materials which his position had enabled him to avail of. His history, according to Kirtane, is a dry narration of the various campaigns of the Marathas.[69]

Justice Ranade's *Rise of the Maratha Power* was a powerful reply to Grant's views on the rise and expansion of the Maratha power. He emphasised on the moral basis or significance of the rise of the Maratha power, which was not like, as Grant thinks, a conflagration in the forests of Sahyadri.[70]

Rajwade, a critical scholar, pointed out a number of omissions and factual mistakes in Grant's history. He rejected this work as incomplete and unauthentic as it was mainly based on secondary sources like *bakhars* and *tawarikhs*. He considered that Grant was not equipped for the task of a historian. He felt that had there been a gifted historian like James Mill, or Gibbon or Mommsen to write the history of the Marathas, he would have achieved wonders with the materials which Duff was fortunate to secure.[71]

Sir Jadunath Sarkar, in the introduction to his *Shivaji and His Times*, simply pointed out how his own work marked an advance on Grant's work as far as source-material was concerned. He stated that he not only used original materials unknown to Grant Duff but also made a minute and careful study of the material known to him.[72]

No British historian has so far critically studied Duff's contribution to historical writing. Professor C. H. Philips, while assessing the contribution of Elphinstone to Indian history, writes, "It (Maratha history) is a straightforward, sympathetic account, invaluable in that it is based on material that has long since disappeared, a classic account though never, in fact, much read." Dr. G. D. Bearce considers it as a pioneer study, yet not a very successful scholarly work. He describes it as "an apology for an imperial undertaking." He writes, "what he told was the account of how a people, through many wars and revolutions, history marked with violence, treachery and ignorance, had arrived at the goal of British Rule. The outcome of this development was the justification of British conquest."[73]

It would be unfair to impute motives to the writing of Grant. It is true that his main object in writing this history was to introduce the Marathas, of whom the public had yet but imperfect information.[74] He had no ill-will towards the Marathas. He identified himself with the Marathas when he wrote, "Briggs is a Mughal or Pathan, and me a *ghureeb Maratha manoos*,"[75] or "he is a Pathan Toork that slaughters kine, and I am a Maratha manoos as can fight or flee."[76]

Grant was aware of his limitations. He was not a trained historian,

as he confessed. "Notwithstanding all I have done, and all I have chalked out, I am perfectly sensible of my inability in many respects for the task of authorship."[77] He had realized that the history of the Marathas was a great subject and that he should not climb higher than that point from which if he did fall, he stood little chance of breaking his neck.[78]

His style was subjected to more criticism. This problem of style always disturbed him. He wished to maintain a plain style with no learned professions or anything which he could not support.[79] His defective style may be attributed to the nature of the subject under study, the type of source -material he had to handle, and the limited time at his disposal to collect and digest the numerous materials.

Duff took a great risk in publishing his work. Before it went to press, it cost him upwards of £2000 and in this entire business his total loss was upwards of £1700.[80] It means that he got only about £300 from the sale of his book. In 1840 it was suggested to him that a revised edition of the book should be published, but neither the publisher recommended it nor did Duff himself show any willingness to undertake the trouble of revising it. Its second edition was published in 1863, and there was a quick succession of editions, the third in 1873, the fourth in 1878, the fifth in 1912 and the last one was published by the Oxford University Press with an introduction by S. M. Edwardes in 1921. Its Marathi translation *Marathyanchi Bakhar* has also gone through six editions.

Grant's history did not attract much attention while he was alive. He did not care much for the fate of his book. He could imagine how the John Bull would yawn at his Maratha history.[81] However, the services rendered by him to the cause of Maratha history in particular and historiography in modern India in general, can hardly be denied. It was not only an advance over Scot Waring who wrote a Maratha history in 1810, but it also stimulated a critical study of Maratha history in India, and scholars including Kincaid and Parasnis, Rao Bahadur G. S. Sardesai, Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Dr. Bal Krishna and Surendra Nath Sen enriched the subject by their painstaking and critical studies.

REFERENCES

1. This biographical note is based on an unpublished and incomplete autobiography of Mount Stuart Elphinstone Grant Duff, the son of Grant Duff, who became the governor of Madras subsequently. The author is indebted to Mrs. Shiela Sokolov Grant, the great-granddaughter of Grant Duff, for making available this manuscript.

Compare this with the 'Memoir of the Author' written by S. M. Edwardes in his introduction to the sixth edition (1921) of Grant Duff's *History of the Marathas*.

2. MSS EUR F88 Box 9C—Mount Stuart Elphinstone to Grant Duff (henceforth referred to as M. E. to G. D., etc.), dated 24.4.1822.
3. Colebrooke, *Life of Mount Stuart Elphinstone*, vol. II, p. 188.
4. Italics mine.
5. D. B. Parasnis, *Mahabaleshwar*, p. 41.
6. Leslie Stephen, *Life of Sir James Fitzjames Stephen* (London, 1895), p. 171.
7. According to S. M. Edwardes 1827. See Introduction to the *History of the Marathas*, vol. I, p. xxxiii. Perhaps this date is correct, as Grant must have married only after the publication of his book, i.e. after 1826.
8. G.D. to M.E., 14.10.1852.
9. *Ibid.*, dated 4.6.1952.
10. *J.I.H.* vol. XV, part 2 (1936), p. 227 (5).
11. The author is indebted to John Murray and Company, London, for making available this letter of Grant Duff, dated 17 January, 1826.
12. Grant Duff, *History of the Marathas*, vol. I, Introduction, p. xxxix.
13. G.D. to Charles Grant, 20.8.1821.
14. G.D. to M.E., 19.7.1819.
15. *Ibid.* Compare this with his Preface to the 1st edition, p. lxxvi (Edwardes Edition).
16. G.D. to M.E., 19.7.1819.
17. M.E. to G.D., 20.7.1819.
18. Deccan College Historical Museum Rumal no. I, File no. 6: 24. This circular is incomplete, and its author and date are unknown. Yet, from the nature of its contents and the place where it was found, it is clear that it must have been issued by Grant Duff between 1818 and 1822.
19. G. Duff, *op. cit.*, Introduction, lxxxvi.
20. *Selections from Peshwa Daftar* (SPD), vol. 42, p. 26.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
22. Chitnis has written the life of Shivaji in seven chapters, *Saptaprakarnatmaka Charitra*.
23. G.D. to M.E., 15.7.1819.
24. SPD, vol. 42, p. 27.
25. G.D. to M.E., 25.6.1820.
26. SPD, vol. 42, p. 31.
27. *Ibid.*
28. M.E. to G.D., 20.4.1822.
29. *Ibid.*, 27.4.1822.
30. G.D. to M.E., 15.7.1819.
31. G.D. to Hutchinson, 1821.
32. G. Duff, *op. cit.*, p. 80 fn. G.D. to Gordon, 15.2.1821.
33. G.D. to M.E., March 1822. Compare this with the 'Life of the Author' given in the 1st volume of the translation of Ferishta written by Briggs.
34. G.D. to Gordon, 15.2.1821.
35. *Ibid.*
36. G.D. to Erskine, 20.2.1821.
37. G.D. to M.E., 19.7.1819.
38. M.E. to G.D., 24.4.1822.
39. G.D. to M.E., 22.6.1822.
40. K. T. Telang, "Gleanings from Maratha Chronicles" (Appendix to Ranade's *Rise of the Maratha Power*, p. 135).
41. The author contacted one of the descendants of Grant Duff, his great-granddaughter, Mrs. Sheila Sokolov Grant, at Woodbridge, but could not trace any papers of Grant Duff.

42. G.D. to M.E., 12.4.1822.
43. M.E. to G.D., 27.4.1822.
44. The India Office Library, London, has preserved these notes of Grant Duff under the title Grant Duff Papers.
45. M.I.S., vol. I, Introduction, p. 32.
46. G. Duff, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 470 fn.
47. G.D. to M.E., 8.7.1820.
48. *Ibid.*, 29.5.1822.
49. *Ibid.*
50. M.E. to G.D., 20.7.1819.
51. *Ibid.*, 4.1.1823.
52. G.D. to M.E., 21.3.1822.
53. *Ibid.*, 9.4.1822.
54. M.E. to G.D., 21.3.1822.
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Ibid.*, 1.4.1822.
57. *Ibid.*
58. *Ibid.*, 5.12.1822.
59. *Ibid.*
60. M.E. to G.D., 8.4.1822.
61. *Ibid.*
62. M.E. to Close, 5.5.1822.
63. M.E. to G.D., 4.1.1823.
64. G. Duff, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 534.
65. *Ibid.*, vol. I, Introduction, p. xi.
66. M.E. to G.D., 4.1.1823.
67. M. G. Ranade, *Rise of the Maratha Power*, p. 104.
68. G.D. to M.E., 22.4.1822.
69. A review of Grant Duff's *History of the Marathas* by a student of the Poona College.
70. M. G. Ranade, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
71. MIS, vol. I, Introduction, pp. 23-32.
72. Sir Jadunath Sarkar, *Shivaji and His Times*, Preface, p. 1.
73. G. D. Bearce, *British Attitudes Towards India*, p. 266.
74. G.D. to Charles Forbes, 9.12.1820.
75. G.D. to M.E., 12.8.1820.
76. *Ibid.*, 31.8.1820.
77. *Ibid.*, 12.10.1820.
78. *Ibid.*, 2.8.1829.
79. *Ibid.*, 31.3.1822.
80. G. Duff, *op. cit.*, *History of the Marathas*, vol. I, Introduction, p. xxxix.
81. G.D. to M.E., 27.4.1827.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

MARK WILKS

Dr. K. N. V. Sastri

(*Mysore University*)

A son to the Rev. James Wilks and Margaret Woods was born at Kirk Michael Vicarage, being named Mark after his godfather, Bishop Hildesley. His father endeavoured to get him on the Charter-House foundation in 1771, but he did not succeed in doing so. Being at one time intended for the ministry he received a classical education, and, in consequence, went to India at a later stage than was usual. He obtained a cadetship in 1781, and in 1782 he received a commission in the Madras army. A fort-adjutant at Fort St. George in 1788, a lieutenant in 1789, a brigade -major and A.D.C. to Colonel James Stuart in 1790-92, and an assistant adjutant-general in 1793; he became ill out of strain in 1795 and was on furlough until 1799. He was made captain, during absence, in 1798, and on return to Madras was appointed its town-major.

From 1803 to 1808, he was Political Resident at the Court of Mysore, attaining the rank of major in 1804 and that of lieutenant-colonel in 1808. (He received the Brevet rank of colonel in 1814.) He fell ill again in 1808, and was on leave until 1811. After another year in India, he resigned and left India for good.

He married (a second time) in 1813 and was to settle down on the Isle of Man. But in March of that year, he accepted the offer of the post of Governor of St. Helena for a three-year term and joined duty in June following. He received Napoleon in 1815 and was in contact with him until April 1816, when his term expired. In the *Monthly Review* (January, 1901, page 65) and in "Notes of Conversations with the Duke of Wellington, 1831-51", by the Earl of Stanhope (London, 1888), the extraordinary friendship between Napoleon and Wilks has been described. Napoleon told the Duke, "Why have they not left that old governor? I could have got on with him. We should not have had quarrels." Wilks retired from the East India Company's service in 1818. Being a native of the Isle of Man, he was associated with the House of Keys in one or the other capacity until he became the Speaker in 1823 after his father-in-law's death.

He had a wonderful knowledge of Oriental languages and literature by virtue of his father's discipline in his 'mother-tongue' (*Manx Advertiser*). His first writing was a *History of the Mahratta War*, which Napoleon praised at St. Helena (*Blackwoods Magazine*, January, 1834). The second, a product of twenty years' research, was *Historical Sketches of the South of India, in an attempt to trace the History of Mysore*. The third was an essay, printed

in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society*, of which Wilks was vice-president, "Akhlac-a-nasire". A fourth was a *Report on the interior administration, resources and expenditure of the government of Mysore*, Fort William, 1805, which is not of the superclass to which the second and third works belong.

Blackwoods Magazine, January, 1834, described Wilks as "a tall, handsome, venerable-looking man, with white curling locks and a courtier -like manner." The Duke of Wellington held that Wilks "was very intelligent, well-read man, and knew everything that had been passing on in Europe, and Napoleon had become really attached to him." In character he was straightforward, modest and kindly. His letters to Sir Mark Cubbon (Chief Commissioner of Mysore, 1834-61), his nephew, published partly by the author of this article in the *Quarterly Journal of Mythic Society*, Bangalore, under "The Training of a Civilian" (in 1933), reveal Wilks's essential qualities of head and heart. The total collection was handed over by this author to the National Archives of India.

Wilks as a historian, apart from a soldier or a statesman, holds a high rank. His *Historical Sketches* (volume I, 1810, and volumes II and III, 1817, London) has not been surpassed in quality. It is "still an authority on the history of Mysore," as stated by C. Hayavadana Rao in 1943 in his own book of *History of Mysore* in three volumes. One may see only the facts as old as 1808 in Wilks's book, but they have been corrected in details since by equally competent writers. But these corrections do not harm Wilks's position as a reliable historian generally. Researches after his time have revealed not only writings in Indian and European languages with fresh points of view but also government records in Indian and European archives, as well as personal and family collections gathered and preserved in homes, public museums and libraries. Wilks himself would have been happy at this tribute to his monumental work.

There is, however, some prejudice yet persisting against him. A Mussalman scholar will not accept even today Wilks's estimate of Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan. He is still of the belief that they had done no wrong to the Rajas of Mysore, to the Hindus and the Christians as such or to the ministers outside the inner circle. This prejudice is due to his ignorance of the geography of Mysore and of the language and tradition of the Mysoreans (including Mussalmans of Mysore). Non-Muslim scholars may be, likewise, ignorant of Islamic Law and Culture. But not every one of them is so ignorant and his prejudice is nothing in comparison with that of his Mussalman brother.

Similarly, the palace chroniclers, employed to write the history of Mysore, do not agree with quite a few of Wilks's conclusions which if he were alive he would not give up; for example, Wilks's version of Chikka Devaraja Wodeyar's connection with the persecution of the Jangams and his vexatious taxes on agricultural farmers have been hotly disputed. This

will be evident from Wilks's version (pp. 219-22, 1930 edition) and Hayavadana Rao's versions (pp. 2461-63, *Mysore Gazetteer*, 1930 edition and pp. 470-95, *History of Mysore*, 1943). There are a few other but minor protests against Wilks's views, which made Sir Murray Hammick (*History of Mysore* by Mark Wilks, vol. I, page xii) say that Wilks turned a blind eye to "the point of view of the Ruling Family." Sir Murray, as Editor of Wilks's *History of Mysore*, turned out to be a panegyrist of the Royal family in his footnotes (e.g. pp. 694 and 773-74, vol. II). The author of this article assisted him in London between 1928 and 1930, but this was not acknowledged except indirectly.

Wilks has clearly enunciated his method of reading and writing clearly in the 'Advertisement' and 'Preface' to his book. He would never accept any fact or figure as true until all evidence (pro and con) was examined. If still in doubt, he would say so either in the text or in the footnote. His footnotes are a mine of information upon subsidiary matters; as a matter of fact, students of Sociology, Religion, Economics, Public Administration or Constitutional History will find them a fertile source of information for the early history of Mysore. Sir Murray Hammick has improved the footnotes only by identifying all proper names; his quotations from other sources in illustration of the text are but acts of display of some learning; he was an I.C.S. Officer in the Madras cadre until he retired as Governor of Madras. The maps are good and accurate; the index is exhaustive. His bibliography is anti-Indian.

Wilks's influence has been tremendous upon the modern historians of Mysore. He was so modest as to avoid giving the title of 'History' to his three volumes running over 1500 pages. In his own country and by his own contemporaries he was honoured with election as a Fellow of the Royal Society. In Mysore State, the citizens of Bangalore established a church to commemorate his services and called it 'St. Marks Church'. P. Krishna Rao abridged Wilks's history for college students in 1868. Any historian who writes either the whole history of Mysore or a part of it, with due acknowledgement to Wilks, will enjoy the confidence of all scholars and statesmen. Wilks was not a descendant but the ancestor of his historical family in modern Mysore.

JAMES TOD

DR. SUKUMAR BHATTACHARYYA

(Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan)

THE founder of modern historiography on Rajasthan, James Tod, was born at Islington in 1782. Leaving America, his father, James Tod senior, came to Mirzapur in U.P., and settled there as an indigo-planter. His maternal uncles were members of the civil service of the East India Company. In 1798, at the age of sixteen, young Tod entered the Company's service as an army cadet. In 1800 he rose to the rank of Lieutenant. In 1805 he was assigned the command of the suite of Graeme Mercer, Agent at the Sindhia's court. They became very intimate. In his *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* Tod speaks of Mercer with a sense of attachment and admiration. It was Mercer who introduced Tod to the intricacies of the Maratha-Rajput politics. About this time Tod started taking an active interest in political as well as historical matters. Between 1812 and 1817 he was engaged in collecting geographical and topographical data on Rajasthan and Central India.

In 1813 Tod was promoted to the rank of Captain and appointed Second Assistant to Strachey, the then Agent at the Sindhia's court. He played an important part in the Company's comprehensive diplomatic and military preparations in Rajputana and Central India in connection with the final war against the Marathas as also the suppression of the Pindaris in 1817-18. His thorough acquaintance with the affairs of Rajputana paved the way for his final appointment in 1818 as Political Agent to the Western Rajput States, in which capacity he served the Company till his premature retirement in June, 1822.

The end of Tod's distinguished official career through premature retirement was unpleasant. The ostensible ground of retirement was ill-health. Incidentally, it may be noted that Tod had taken leave of absence on the ground of bad health only twice during his entire service career of about twenty-four years in India, though he had long suffered from malaria. The closing days of his service career were marked by the depreciation of his pro-Rajput attitude in higher official circles. As Bishop Heber puts it, "His misfortune was that, in consequence of his favouring the native princes so much, the Government of Calcutta were led to suspect him of corruption and consequently to narrow his powers...till he (in disgust) resigned his place.... They are now, I believe, well-satisfied that their suspicions were groundless."

In alluding to his pre-retirement excessive strain, both physical and

mental, Tod personally observed, "My health was so worn out by the laborious and incessant duties of so extensive a charge (which afterwards gave sufficient employment to four district agents) that it would have been impossible for me to get through another season. Occupied from twelve to fourteen hours daily, amidst surrounding broils and discords, visited every alternate day with excruciating headache, and doomed to severe abstinence, though without intermission of toil, the only wonder to my medical friends was that I escaped this ordeal, and outlived such constant persecution." The discredited officer was indeed destined to 'outlive' to be immortalised as a historian.

Out of his about twenty-four years' stay in India Tod spent eighteen years either in Rajputana or in association with the Rajputs—the last five years being spent as the Political Agent in Mewar, Marwar, Jaisalmer, Kotah, Bundi and Sirohi. This long and intimate connection that Tod had with the Rajputs and their country largely enabled him to become well acquainted with their history and society. It was indeed no vain boast on his part to "have passed the better portion" of his life among the Rajput people.

Tod lived for thirteen years after his departure for England. During this period he made frequent tours on the continent. In 1824 he was given the rank of Major, and in 1826 that of Lieutenant-Colonel. His life's account was brought to a sudden close on November 17, 1835, while he was transacting business at his bankers' office in London.

Tod's taste for the study of history, antiquities and ethnology found stimulus from the pioneering work of Sir William Jones and other scholars in the *Asiatic Researches*. Filled with historical enthusiasm, Tod inspiringly wrote: "Let not the antiquary forget the old cities of East and West of the Jamna, in the desert and in the Punjab...where his toil will be richly rewarded."

While in England, Tod mostly engaged himself in compiling his materials into two valuable works on which rests his abiding place of honour in the field of historical writing: the *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* and the *Travels in Western India*. During this period he was closely connected with the Royal Asiatic Society, and for some time acted as its Librarian. The large collection of manuscripts, inscriptions and coins which he had taken to England were presented by him to the Society. Tod's own observation in this connection, throwing light on his historical mind, is illuminating: "The contents of many, still unexamined, may throw additional light on the history of ancient India. I claim only the merit of having brought them to the knowledge of European scholars; but I may hope that this will furnish a stimulus to others to make similar exertions."

Of his two works, the less known *Travels in Western India* was published

posthumously in 1839. This travel diary records his extensive tour in 1822 on the eve of his departure from India, embracing his visit to the 'Sacred Mounts' of the Jains and the 'celebrated shrines' of the Hindus between Rajputana and the Indus. It consists of twenty-three chapters covering 518 pages, preceded by the author's memoir. This account is a miscellaneous collection of useful geographical, historical, religious and sociological data. It deals with the aspect and climate of the Aravallis as also with the geography of Sirohi and Cutch. It contains information about the hill tribes and aborigines like the Minas and the Bhils. In this work Tod dwells on the history of the ancient city of Anhilwara (or 'Nehrwalla'). He treats of such matters as the political condition of Cutch and the conclusion of an alliance between Sirohi and the Company. He also writes of Meera Bai, the celebrated Rajput poetess.

Tod's *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* is a classic work on Rajput history and sociology. It was originally brought out in two volumes between 1829 and 1832. It has been reprinted several times since then. It is the finest outcome of his long association with, and deep attachment for, the heroic 'land of Rajas' and its 'races.' The purpose behind his pronounced "endeavour to draw a faithful picture" of the "ancient and interesting" Rajput people and their princes was not merely to unfold their history before the outside world but also to impress upon His Majesty's Government their "sighs" for "the restoration of their former independence." Tod set himself to present their history against a comprehensive background of the geography of their land, their economic resources, their social system and political organisation, their religion and culture. The *Annals* is a store-house of materials, dealing with "many matters which usually find no place in any historical work." It has been called "an encyclopaedia on Rajasthan and the Rajputs."

This voluminous work of Tod covers 1835 pages in Crooke's annotated three-volume edition, being subdivided into eleven 'Books' consisting of 106 chapters. The first chapter comprising Book One is on "Geography of Rajasthan or Rajputana". Two chapters on "Sketch of the Indian Desert" primarily deal with matters of geographical interest. Twenty-one chapters on "Personal Narrative", written in the form of a travel diary, contain valuable geographical information. Geographical references also occur in the historical sketches of individual Rajput states. Tod's treatment of the geography of the land, though unsystematic, full of repetitions and lacking in completeness and at times in accuracy, is extensive. It also indicates the author's aliveness to the importance of the geographical background of historical knowledge.

The socio-economic conditions in Rajputana have also been discussed in the *Annals*, though not on a comprehensive basis. The treatment of the subject is not merely inexhaustive but also more factual than analytical. The nature and fertility of land, agricultural and industrial

production, trade and trade-routes are treated in this work partly on the basis of personal knowledge and partly on the basis of data obtained from official documents. In the chapter under the caption "Sketch of a Feudal System in Rajasthan" the author deals with relations between the landed aristocracy and the cultivators as also the different categories of slavery. Statistical data regarding different orders of the population of Rajasthan are given in course of the separate surveys of individual states. The position of women in the Rajput society has also been dealt with. Though Tod omits to give in detail an account of the marriage regulations and ceremonies of the Rajputs, such social questions as the burning of widows, infanticide and *Jauhar* did not escape his attention. Scattered but valuable information regarding the hill tribes, such as the Bhils, Mers and Minas, is also found in the *Annals*.

An extensive survey of religion in Rajputana is found in four chapters of the *Annals*. These chapters contain interesting and valuable information regarding gods and goddesses, religious festivals and ceremonies, religious practices and superstitions, religious gifts, and Brahmanical and Jain influences on society and administration.

In the chapters on "History of the Rajput Tribes" the author traces the origin of the Rajputs. This discussion is, however, not based on a critical study of scientifically accepted data.

As it appears from a study of the *Annals*, Tod was "more interested in the Rajasthan of pre-Mughal days than in the devastated, miserable, politically crippled Rajasthan of his own time". His study, in the *Annals*, of political developments in the Rajput principalities during the eighteenth century is not only incomplete but also lacking in precision. The treatment of British relations with the Rajput states is brief and restrained by caution imposed by his official position. Although occasionally outspoken in his criticism of British policy, he could not disclose all the facts to which he had access as a servant of the Company. In this connection a modern writer observes, "He might have, if he had so desired, left for us a complete and authentic account of the establishment of British suzerainty over the principalities of Rajasthan. But, unlike Grant Duff and Cunningham, he preferred silence."

In his historical approach and outlook Tod was comprehensive. He did not look at the history of the Rajputs merely from the military point of view, though their traditional gallantry captivated him. He "did not look upon the Rajput as a mere warrior but viewed Rajput life as a whole." His perspective was broad. In this respect a comparison may be drawn between Tod and other contemporary official-historians like Duff and Cunningham who wrote on the Marathas and the Sikhs respectively. "Tod was the only British historical writer of those days who did not confine his attention to princely battles and oligarchical squabbles". His *Annals* is "the most comprehensive monograph ever compiled by a British officer

describing one of the leading peoples of India". The method that Tod followed "led him to formulate theories on a wide range of subjects not directly connected with the Rajputs". His *Annals* marks a stage in the development of the study of Indian religions, ethnology and sociology. It has been regarded as the first serious attempt to investigate the beliefs of the Indian peasantry.

Though Tod made an attempt at a comprehensive study of the Rajputs, he was not keen upon "fulfilling the rigorous demands of history". He was more a compiler of facts than a critical historian. In this respect also Tod differs from his contemporary official-historians, Duff and Cunningham. Aware of its "imperfect form" as a piece of strict historical writing, Tod appears to have preferred the title *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* to that of *History of Rajasthan.* As Tod writes, "it was never my intention to treat the subject in the severe style of history, which would have excluded many details useful to the politician as well as to the curious student. I offer this work as a copious collection of materials for the future historian; and am far less concerned at the idea of giving too much, than at the apprehension of suppressing what might possibly be useful." Notwithstanding its limitation as a critical historical work, the *Annals* will ever remain as a classic contribution to the history of Rajasthan. Dr. A. C. Banerjee observes in this connection, "...the writing of annals is an art which serves the cause of history and cannot, therefore, be ignored by the most discerning and fastidious historian."

In giving his estimate of Tod as "a most delightful and industrious collector of materials for history", a contemporary critic observed, "...his own narrative style in many places displays great freedom, vigour, and perspicuity. Though not always correct, and occasionally stiff and formal, it is not seldom highly animated and picturesque. The faults of his works are inseparable from its nature; it would have been almost impossible to mould into one continuous history the distinct and separate annals of the various Rajput races."

The collection of materials as a vital precondition to the writing of history was not lost sight of by Tod. During his long service in Central India and Rajputana he showed an untiring zeal in the search for historical data. He says, "From the earliest period of my official connexion with this interesting country, I applied myself to collect and explore its early historical records, with a view to throwing some light upon a people scarcely yet known in Europe. It would be wearisome to the reader to be minutely informed of the process I adopted, to collect the scattered relics of Rajput history into the form and substance in which he now sees them." Tod "began with the sacred genealogy from the Puranas; examined the Mahabharata, and the poems of Chand; the voluminous historical poems of Jaisalmer, Marwar, and Mewar; the histories of the Khichis, and those of the Hara princes of Kotah and Bundi etc., by their respective bards".

For a period of ten years he employed himself, with the help of his Jain Guru, Yati Gyanchandra, and other local scholars, "in ransacking every work which could contribute any facts or incidents to the history of the Rajputs, or diffuse any light upon their manners and character". Tod further writes, "At much expense, and during many wearisome hours, to support which required no ordinary degree of enthusiasm, I endeavoured to possess myself not merely of their history, but of their religious notions, their familiar opinions, and their characteristic manners, by associating with their chiefs and bardic chroniclers, and by listening to their traditionary tales and allegorical poems."

As evident from his foregoing observation, Tod largely relied on the "heroic poems" composed by Chand and other bards as a source of information. He was alive to the "impaired fidelity" of the legendary verses, there being "a sort of compact or understanding between the bard and the princes, a barter of 'solid pudding against empty praise' ". Yet he could not ignore the merits of bardic literature. As he observes, "Bards may be regarded as the primitive historians of mankind...although open to...objections, the works of the native bards afford many valuable data, in facts, incidents, religious opinions, and traits of manners." Further, the value of bardic literature as an indication of the beliefs and habits prevalent in the age of the composer can hardly be ignored. Tod's excessive dependence on bardic literature may partly be ascribed to the limited availability of source-materials in his days. The value of Tod's work, particularly in regard to the early history of the Rajput dynasties, diminishes from the modern point of view, being based more on literary evidence than on a proper utilisation of numismatic and epigraphic evidence. Tod also failed to utilise the Persian chronicles throwing valuable light on the affairs of the Rajput principalities since the days of the Turkish penetration. His *Annals* also betrays his lack of familiarity with Marathi news-letters. Moreover, he does not appear to have consulted the official documents, in the custody of the Rajput rulers, throwing light on the Rajput-Maratha relations. Thus Tod's equipage in respect of source -materials was defective.

Tod saw the Rajputs in a phase of transition. Crooke observes, "It was a happy accident that before the period of transition had begun in earnest, such a competent and sympathetic observer should have been able to examine and record one of the most surviving phases of the ancient Hindu polity." Tod, in fact, contributed to the early romantic school of British historical thought in India that showed a sympathetic understanding of the Indian problems and, unlike the rationalists and evangelicals, believed that the Indians "would have to undergo change, but slowly, with deference to their own institutions and not on speculative principles". It was this spirit of sympathetic understanding that was reflected in his views on the question of British supremacy over, and intervention

in, the Rajput states in the light of the Company's interpretation of its treaties with them. Thus he wrote in the *Annals*, "There is a perpetual variation between the spirit and the letter of every treaty; and while the internal independence of every state is the ground work, it is frittered away and nullified by successive stipulation." With his deep admiration of the principle "paternity of the Sovereign" governing the Rajput polity, Tod expressed himself in favour of the harmonization of British supremacy with the age-old political institutions and social order of the Rajputs. But he failed to realise that the spirit of the time and the basic nature of the alien rule "were altogether inconsistent with the full survival of the old order in Rajasthan."

Tod's analysis of the socio-economic system of the Rajputs is rather superficial. He fails to stress the underlying defects of their rigid economic structure. Its collapse is ascribed to the "predatory" inroads of the Marathas only. He omits to emphasize the effects of the scarcity of cultivable land and the traditional caste monopoly in trade and industry.

In seeking to establish "the common origin of the martial tribes of Rajasthan and those of ancient Europe", Tod observes, "I have expatiated at some length upon the evidence in favour of the existence of a feudal system in India, similar to that which prevailed in the early ages on the European continent." He was naturally influenced by Henry Hallam's *View of the State of Europe During the Middle Ages*, published in 1818. While "steering through the dark channels of antiquity by the feeble lights of forgotten chronicles and imperfect records", he, however, appears to have unguardedly ignored the caution given by Hallam himself. In his note of caution Hallam said, "It is of great importance to be on our guard against seeming analogies which vanish away when they are closely observed." Tod in his *Annals* has actually traced certain analogies between the tribal institutions of the Rajputs and the social organisation of medieval Europe, on which is based his extensive but undogmatic review of the so-called 'Feudal' system in Rajasthan.

Tod's discussion of the problem of the origin of the Rajputs is not based on a critical examination of scientifically accepted materials. Relying on incomplete data in the form of prevailing traditions as also socio-religious peculiarities of the Rajputs, he reached his conclusion regarding their so-called "Scythic" origin. Though his view is not historically authentic, the merit of his discussion lies in its anticipation of the rational determination of the foreign origin of at least a section of the Rajputs by later writers.

With regard to dates and sequences of events, Tod is not always correct. In adapting the dates of the Sambat to those of the Christian era, Tod showed the habit of deducting 56 and not 57 from the former. This runs counter to the modern practice.

His prejudices are clear. These are visible in his writings. His pro

-Rajput sentiments are well-known. Great was his admiration for Rajput chivalry. "The fierce light of the Rajput knight's self-sacrifice—the glitter of his shining sword—dazzled Tod's eyes." Captivated by the traditional gallantry of the Rajputs, Tod observes, "there is not a petty state in Rajasthan that has not had its Thermopylae, and scarcely a city that has not produced its Leonidas." It is true that he did not overlook the evil effects of addiction to opium upon the character of the Rajput people. The weaknesses of their character, though not enumerated in detail by Tod, are manifest in his *Annals*. Yet Tod has more pity than the impartial critic of today for the grave blemishes that tainted Rajput character.

Of all the Rajput clans Tod had special regard for the Sesodias of Mewar, whom he had the pleasure of knowing intimately. He was decidedly prejudiced against the Kachhwahas of Jaipur. His anti-Kachhwaha bias may partly be ascribed to "their hesitation in accepting British alliance, a policy in which he was deeply interested". The distribution of space in the *Annals* for the individual states markedly reflects the author's bias. True, the comprehensiveness of the work in the sense that it traces the history of all the Rajput states, big and small, is beyond question. Tod, however, gives much more space to the political narrative of Mewar than to that of any other principality. "The epic portion of Tod's narrative relates to Mewar; the story of Jaipur is a mere epilogue which was written for current political purposes." Though the history of Mewar goes back to much older days than that of others, it was not the foremost Rajput state in the days of Tod. During the earlier period of Mughal domination the rulers of Mewar had already lost their former pre-eminence in Rajputana, while the rulers of Marwar and Jaipur rose in position and prosperity under imperial patronage. As Dr. A. C. Banerjee observes, "...no political observer in the early 19th century would have overlooked the patent fact that, politically speaking, Marwar and Jaipur were the premier States of Rajasthan and were entitled to the historian's attention in a greater measure than Mewar."

Tod was never tired of crying down the policy of Aurangzeb. To quote him, "Aurangzeb accumulated on his head more crimes than any prince who ever sat on an Asiatic throne...he was never betrayed, even in the fever of success, into a single generous action...when (he)...neglected the indigenous Rajputs, he endangered the keystone of his power." His attitude towards the Marathas was definitely hostile. He indeed "shared" the jealousy and ill-will which the Rajputs nourished for the Maratha plunderers. In fact, he went beyond "the limits of balanced historical judgement" in his censure of their "predatory" inroads into Rajputana. "It was not easy for an average British officer to judge the Marathas in those days except in the light of their hostility towards the Company's flag. For a friend of the Rajputs the Marathas were open to double condemnation."

With all his shortcomings, Tod occupies a high and abiding place as the first modern historian of Rajasthan. It was he who introduced to the Western readers the Rajput "people scarcely yet known in Europe." His invaluable contribution lies in the laying of the foundation of the systematic study of the history of the land. Tod's *Annals* is not only a classic regional survey but also representative of a phase in the study of Indian antiquity, ethnology, religions and sociology. In his appreciation of Tod as a Rajasthan historian, Crooke observes, "When, if ever, a new history of the Rajputs comes to be written, it must be largely based on Tod's collections, supplemented by wider historical, antiquarian, and epigraphical research." The books published so far on the history of Rajasthan, both in Hindi and English, largely bear out this encomium. Apart from its historical impact, the *Annals* has served as a model and a store-house of materials for the patriotic literature which, in keeping with the spirit of the time, has grown since the advent of nationalism in modern India. The indebtedness that the posterity owes to the historian Tod, indeed, finds an apt expression in the glowing tribute paid by Dr. Qanungo: "In him the Hellas of Hindustan found a Herodotus, from him came the impetus to our later historians, and his immortal work fires the imagination of our people over a century. His *Annals* may have proved partly out of date; but it will ever remain a source of pride and patriotic inspiration."

JOSEPH DAVEY CUNNINGHAM

DR. BAKHSHISH SINGH NIJJAR

(Director of State Archives, Patiala, Punjab)

JOSEPH DAVEY CUNNINGHAM, popularly known as the 'Historian of the Sikhs', was the eldest son of Allen Cunningham (1784-1842), the well-known author. At the age of eighteen Allen made the acquaintance of Hogg, the Ettrich Shepherd, and the acquaintance ripened into a warm friendship. Early in the nineteenth century, Allen commenced his career as an author, and his poems began to appear in various periodicals. He became a great scholar, but his connection with the Chantrey gave him an intimate knowledge of the artistic world which he turned to account in his "Lives of the Most Eminent British Painters, Sculptors, and Architects", which he published from 1829 to 1833. He died in 1842, leaving behind five sons and a daughter.

Joseph Davey Cunningham, the 'Historian of the Sikhs', was born in Lambeth on June 9, 1812. He was educated at different private schools in London, and showed such aptitude for mathematics that his father was strongly advised by his friends to send his son to Cambridge. But the boy wished to be a soldier; and, at his father's request, Sir Walter Scott procured him a cadetship in the East India Company's Army.[1] He proceeded to Addiscombe, where his career was very brilliant, and passed out of that college, obtaining the first prize for mathematics, the sword for good conduct, and the first nomination to the Bengal Engineers in 1831. He then went to Chatham, where he passed through the course of professional training given to the young officers of the Royal Engineers, and received the highest praise from his instructors, Colonels Pasley and Jebb.

Later Cunningham sailed for India in February, 1834, with strong letters of introduction to many Scotsmen then filling high jobs in India. On reaching here he was appointed to the staff of General Macleod, the then Chief Engineer in the Bengal Presidency, and in 1837 he was selected, entirely without solicitation from himself, by Lord Auckland to join Colonel (afterward Sir) Claude Wade,[2] who was then the Political Agent on the Sikh Frontier, as Assistant, with the special duty of fortifying Firozepur, the Agent's headquarters.

In 1838 he was present at the interview between Lord Auckland and Maharaja Ranjit Singh. In 1839 he accompanied Colonel Wade when he forced the Khyber Pass, and was promoted to the rank of First Lieutenant on 20 May, 1839. In 1840 he was placed in charge of Ludhiana, under G. Russel Clerk, Colonel Wade's successor, and as political officer

accompanied Brigadier-General Shelton and his army through the Sikh territory to Peshawar on his way to Kabul. Later he joined Colonel Wheeler and Dost Muhammad, the deposed Amir of Afghanistan, back to the British territory. In 1841 he was sent on a special mission to the principality of Jammu and in 1842 he was present at the interview between Lord Ellenborough, Dost Muhammad and the Sikhs. In 1843 he was assistant to Colonel Richmond, Mr. Clerk's successor, and in 1844 and 1845 he was the British Agent to the native state of Bahawalpur.[3]

These numerous appointments made him thoroughly conversant with the Sikh character. His appointment as the Political Agent on the Sikh Frontier had brought Cunningham into close association and deep concern with the Sikhs, and, as he spent the next eight years of his life in political employments in the Punjab he was able to obtain that thorough knowledge of their manners and customs which made his *History of the Sikhs* one of the most valuable books ever published on Indian History.[4]

When the First Sikh War broke out in December, 1845, he was attached first to the headquarters of Sir Charles Napier in Sindh,[5] and then to that of Sir Hugh Gough, the General Commanding of the army in the field. Sir Hugh Gough, on January 16, 1846, sent J. D. Cunningham to act as political officer with the division under the command of Sir Harry Smith, the victor of Aliwal. With Sir Harry he was present at the skirmish of Baddowal (January 21, 1846) and the battle of Aliwal (January 28, 1846).

When Sir Harry Smith joined the main Army, Joseph Davey Cunningham was attached to the staff of Sir Henry Hardinge, to whom he acted as additional aide-de-camp at the battle of Sabraon (February 10, 1846). For this service he was promoted to the rank of Captain by Brevet on December 10, 1845, and on the conclusion of the war was appointed by Sir Henry Hardinge to the lucrative office of the Political Agent at Bhopal.

Cunningham was thus singularly fortunate, and having now comparative leisure, he devoted himself to historical research. His earliest works were chiefly connected with archaeological and antiquarian studies, in connection with which his brother, Major-General Sir Alexander Cunningham, had become famous; but he soon settled down, on his father's advice, to write his great work, the *History of the Sikhs*. He spent four years on this book, and on its publication in 1849 it was received with the greatest favour by the English Press—a verdict which posterity has ratified, for it is universally recognised as the one great authority on the subject.

Though Cunningham's history established his reputation as the 'Historian of the Sikhs', it brought him into deep disgrace with his superiors. Debate on the vote of thanks in both Houses of Parliament went off very well on the Punjab affairs;[6] but a discordant note was struck in the House

of Commons by a member, George Thompson, who had given notice demanding a discussion of the Punjab Policy of Lord John Russel's Whig Government. A breeze in Parliament over the matter, however, resulted in a personal tragedy for the 'Historian of the Sikhs'. Thompson had accused the Government of suppression of documents in the Blue Book presented to Parliament; he made a pointed reference to J. D. Cunningham's recently published *History of the Sikhs* which referred to despatches in the Secret Department, previously suppressed by Lord Broughton.[7]

Hobhouse, taking a serious view of opening the secret documents of the British Government by their very responsible officer, wrote at once to the Governor-General: "I learn that his (Thompson's) chief reliance is on a good-for-nothing book published by one of your functionaries—I mean Captain Cunningham, your Resident at Bhopal; I have looked into it unwillingly, and find passages in it, besides allusions to despatches in the Secret Department. If these letters have not been published in Parliamentary document, I would recommend you call him to account for breach of trust and remove him from his post."[8]

In the Blue Book presented to the Parliament in April, 1849, Lord Dalhousie's Minute of 30th September, 1848, on annexation and some other documents had been designedly omitted. The Governor-General acted most promptly on the orders received soon after from the Court. A little earlier, Major Carmichael Smyth had been publicly reprimanded for his 'infamous book', the *Reigning Family of Lahore*, but towards Cunningham a sterner course was adopted. "The case is a gross one and the example will be wholesome." Consequently, Cunningham was charge-sheeted for breach of trust and soon after dismissed from service.[9]

In writing the *History of the Sikhs* from the origin of the nation to the Battle of Sutlej, Joseph Davey Cunningham strictly followed the instructions of Colonel Gurwood which he gave in his important work, the *Despatches of the Duke of Wellington*, "The greatest of history is the exact illustration of events as they occurred; and there should neither be exaggeration nor concealment, to suit angry feelings or personal disappointment. History should contain the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." This maxim he followed religiously in this book as well in his article, the "Decline and Fall of the Sikhs," published in the *Calcutta Review* in 1849.[10]

The author, as he tells us in his own prefatory note, spent eight years of his service (from 1838 to 1846) in close contact with the Sikhs, and that too during a very important period of their history. His contact began with the interview between Lord Auckland and Ranjit Singh in 1838 and lasted till the close of the First Sikh War, when he became Resident at Bhopal.

The result of his eight years' residence was to give him a great insight into the history of the Sikhs, and to inspire in him a partiality which is only too clearly visible in his handling of the events leading up to the outbreak of hostilities with the British. The whole book bears evidence of the most meticulous care taken by its author.

The author started with the country and its people. There is a detailed description of the industries of the Punjab and its dependencies, much of which has been rendered archaic by the natural march of events. The ethnological part of this chapter has been carefully done, though this again is in need of supplementation in the light of modern researches. It seems hardly necessary to guide the modern reader in this direction when so many excellent gazetteers are now available, but for a very lucid summary of the Hill States of the Punjab and their peoples, a subject in which the author is a little difficult to follow.[11]

Next he dealt with the old religions of India. Here again knowledge has moved forward and much of the author's information has become archaic. His conception of the *lingam* and its significance, for example, is not in consonance with modern theory. Unfortunately, too, he lived before the days when the labours of the Archaeological Department had thrown a flood of light upon the teachings of the Buddha and the prevalence of his religion in India. Indeed, his only reference to the British in this connection is an accusation of iconoclasm which reads strangely to a modern generation. His account of 'modern reforms' naturally stops at an early point, and he seems to have been led into the somewhat erroneous conclusion that the whole Indian world—the Hindu and the Muslim—at the time of his writing the work was moving in the direction of a new revelation. The chapter concludes with an account of Guru Nanak and his teaching.

After this Cunningham dealt with the lives and teachings of the Gurus. The gradual spread of the Sikh religion in the Punjab led to the establishment of a sort of *imperium in imperio*. This development caused the Mughal emperors to follow a line of policy much like that adopted by the Roman emperors, when confronted by the rising organization of the Christian Church. This policy—one of repression and persecution—caused a profound modification of the whole Sikh system. The simple altruism of the early days was laid aside, and under Gobind Singh, the tenth and last Guru, the Sikhs became a definite fighting force. At first the armies of the *Khalsa* met with little success, and the death of Guru Gobind Singh in 1708, followed by that of Banda Singh Bahadur, his successor in the command of the armies, in 1716, seemed to sound the death-knell of Sikh hopes and ambitions. But the fervour of their belief rose triumphant over persecution, and the Sikhs found their opportunity in the years of disorder which followed the death of Emperor Bahadur Shah in 1712.

Then the author narrated the story of the gradual establishment of Sikh independence down to 1764. Northern India was a wild welter of confusion. The Mughal Empire was falling rapidly to pieces under the repeated blows of invaders from the north and the south. First, Nadir Shah and his Persian hosts, and then, the Afghan Ahmad Shah Durrari swept down the imperial capital. Like many unfortunate happenings, Delhi fell again and again in the hands of spoilers, and its glories became a thing of the past. The advent of the Marathas upon the scene seemed at first the prelude to the establishment of Hindu supremacy in northern India. But the battle of Panipat (1761) proved fatal to their ambitions and left the stage open for the development of a new power in the Punjab.

Amid all this confusion the Sikhs gradually achieved their independence. At first, they were mere bands of plunderers, but gradually these bands became united into a formidable fighting force. In 1742 the army of the *Khalsa* became a recognized organisation under Jassa Singh Ahluwalia, and though it frequently suffered defeat, it never lost its definite character after that date. The Sikhs sustained their great disaster at the hands of the Afghans at Ludhiana, in 1762, but the waves of Afghan invasion had spent their strength. In 1763, at Sirhind, the Sikhs avenged their defeat of the previous year and permanently occupied the province of Sirhind. In the following year, which witnessed the last Afghan invasion, they became master of Lahore, and in the same year at a meeting at Amritsar, organized themselves into a ruling political system, described by the author as a "Theocratic Confederate Feudalism". The condition of the Punjab during these years of bloodshed and disorder was miserable to the extreme.

The Sikhs had become a nation and in theory a united nation, but in actual fact such was far from being the case. The new State was composed of a number—twelve is the usually recognized total—of leagues or *Misals*. Instead of uniting and forming a solid State, these *Misals* were almost constantly engaged in civil war, grouping and re-grouping in the struggle for pre-eminence. It needed a strong hand to check these internecine disputes, and, fortunately for the Punjab, Ranjit Singh appeared on the scene. The career of the one-eyed 'Lion of the Punjab' is fully described in the text and needs but little reference at this point. The Maharaja's real career commenced with his acquisition of Lahore in 1799. From that date he steadily extended his sway over the whole of the Punjab. Many books have been written on the career of this remarkable man and upon the system of comparatively orderly government which he introduced. As regards his character, he was not altogether without faults. Temperance and chastity were not his conspicuous virtues. But, with all his shortcomings, he was a strong and able ruler, admirably suited to the conditions of the time. The Maharaja's territorial expansion brought him

into contact with the Cis-Sutlej States, which were under English protection, and so into contact with the English.

The death of Ranjit Singh in 1839 was the signal for the outbreak of a series of palace revolutions, in which the army of the *Khalsa* played a ghastly part. This period of the story is fully dealt with by the author in chapter VIII. The disorder culminated in the crossing of the Sutlej by the Sikh forces and the consequent outbreak of the First Anglo-Sikh War. From this point of the story the partiality of the author caused many of his statements to be viewed with suspicion. In his eyes, the war represented a national tide of self-preservation rising against the ever-encroaching power of England. Such was far from being the case, and very different motives actuated the corrupt administration of Lahore. Terrified of the power of the army, that administration flung its legions across the Sutlej in the hope that they would be either annihilated or so seriously crippled as to cease to be a danger in the future. At the same time, the outbreak of hostilities would divert attention from the shortcomings of the Central Government—a political manoeuvre, strongly reminiscent of some of the actions of Napoleon III.

The author gave a somewhat turgid description of the battles of the war indeed; the language of the account of the battle of Sabraon reminds one of the story of the battle in the poems of Robert Montgomery—and he concluded his narrative by some general remarks upon the English policy in India.

Cunningham's account of the Anglo-Sikh relations is very useful indeed, although the same cannot be said of the earlier account, which is in some places subject to correction. The author also does not touch on the Second Anglo-Sikh War and the resultant annexation at all; but, as he was transferred to Bhopal at the conclusion of the first, he probably lost touch with the Punjab politics.

In the references, and also in the text, from chapter V to the end of the volume, the names of military officers and civil functionaries were quoted without any nice regard to the rank they might have held at the particular time, or to the titles by which they might have been subsequently distinguished. But, as there was one person only of each name to be referred to, no doubt or inconvenience ever arose from that laxity. Thus the youthful Mr. Metcalfe at the treaty with Ranjit Singh, and Sir Charles Metcalfe so honourably connected with the history of India, was the Lord Metcalfe of riper years and approved services in another hemisphere. Lieutenant-Colonel, or more briefly Colonel, Pottinger was then a Major -General and a Grand Cross of the Bath; while Mr. Clerk had been made a knight of the same Order, and Lieutenant-Colonel Lawrence was raised to an equal title. Captain, or Lieutenant-Colonel, or Sir, Claude Wade, meant one and the same person; and similarly the late Sir Alexander Burnes sometimes appeared as a simple Lieutenant, or as a Captain, or

as a Lieutenant-Colonel. On the other hand, Sir David Ochterlony was referred to solely under that title, although, when he marched to the Sutlej in 1809, he held the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel only.

Cunningham's history is mostly based on official records of the Political Department, where he was himself employed, and on his personal observation. He was trained in the method of historical writing and had in most cases authenticated his account with footnotes referring to the sources from where he had derived the information. He used traditional accounts and also the secondary sources, which were available to him. He based his early history (Guru Period) on the *Adi-Granth*, the *Dabistan-i-Mazahib* and the *Siyar-ul-Mutakherin* in addition to the traditional accounts. The whole account is a well-documented study of the scholar, who diligently compared his own opinions with the authentic and comparative footnotes given therein. His method is that of a researcher and a critic, with an insight into the facts. In addition to the Despatches in the Secret Department which he used at the cost of his own disgrace and dismissal from the high post, other secret and private documents of contemporary persons who were holding the key-posts to conduct the Punjab affairs have also been carefully used.

Cunningham is the most unbiased historian whose critics could not condemn him. He did not condemn people like Abdul Qader Badauni, as he did some non-Muslims, and also, he could not be pro-British like Muhammad Latif. It was due to his unbiased approach and the authenticity of his facts that he was disgraced by his own community and the Government.

The influence of Cunningham on the contemporary and later historians of the Sikhs has been great. He has been quoted by almost every historian of the Sikhs, contemporary as well as later, very freely and authoritatively. Prominent among them are L. B. Griffin (*The Rajas of the Punjab*), Sir Denzil Ibbetson (*A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab, etc.*), Syed Muhammad Latif (*History of the Punjab*), Dr. G. C. Narang (*Transformation of Sikhism*), Dr. H. R. Gupta (*History of the Sikhs*), Dr. Ganda Singh and Mr. Khushwant Singh.

However, it is a very difficult task to give here the names of all historians of Sikh history who quoted Cunningham as authority in their works. His observations in the *History of the Sikhs* have not yet been refuted by historians, generally on the early period, and particularly on the later period. He was an eye-witness to many of the events narrated by him and wrote the *History of the Sikhs* and also his article, entitled "The Decline and Fall of the Sikhs", like the greatest history in the exact illustration of events as they occurred.

REFERENCES

1. Allen had become a great friend of Sir Walter Scott when the latter was sitting for Chantrey, and in 1820 submitted him a drama, *Sir Marmaduke Maxwell.*
2. Claude Martin Wade was born on April 3, 1794, joined the Army in 1809 and was appointed diplomatic agent at Ludhiana and placed in charge of Shah Shujah, the exiled king of Afghanistan.
3. Bahawalpur was the capital of the State of the same name. It was founded in 1748 by Bahawal Khan.
4. "The Best History of Sikhs by an Englishman," writes Sir Gokal Chand Narang. (*Transformation of Sikhism.*)
5. Sir Charles James Napier (1782-1853) was the conqueror of Sindh. Early in 1849 the troubles produced a general demand in England for a change of the command and Napier was sent to assume the charge of the Punjab, but the Sikh war was over before he reached Calcutta.
6. Coulston House Dalhousie Papers.
7. Hobhouse to Dalhousie, 21 April, 1849.
8. P. S. to the above letter, dated 29 April, 1849.
9. Though Cunningham's dismissal was ostensibly for using official papers without authority, the Press made comments that his removal was brought about on account of the disagreeable comments against the Government. "All Captain Cunningham says," so ran the comments, "we now know is based on authentic public papers; therefore, it must all be true." (Dalhousie to Hobhouse, 25 May, 1849.)
10. *The Calcutta Review*, January-July, 1849, pp. 523-58.
11. Reference may well be made to an article (in vol. iii of the *Journal of the Punjab Historical Society*) by Messrs. Hutchinson and Vogel, which is admirably explicit and is supplemented by a short Bibliography on the subject.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

SIR WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER

DR. K. K. SHARMA

(N. A. S. College, Meerut University)

SIR WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER plunged into the arena of authorship with a promise to bring India closer to the English heart. He initiated an appreciative response to the discovery of India's past and contributed substantially to her momentous enterprise of self-discovery and self-understanding. He addressed himself to the task of rewriting Indian history. He has been classed among the Liberal Philosopher historians by his modern counterparts.[1] But he was essentially an Imperialist historian presenting an empire-oriented image of India's past, to sustain an imperialist ideology.

Hunter realised that the true history of India was yet to be written. He set out to complete this project by employing the new intellectual lights. He stressed this need in one of his prefaces: "In this book I try to exhibit the growth of the Indian peoples, to show what part they have played in the world's progress, and what sufferings they have endured from other nations. Short Indian histories, as written by Englishmen, usually dismiss the first two thousand years of their narrative in a few pages, and start by disclosing India as a conquered country. This plan is not good, either for Europeans in India or for the Indians themselves; nor does it accord with the facts. As long as Indian history is presented to the Indian youth as nothing but a dreary record of disunion and subjection, our Anglo-Indian schools can scarcely become the nurseries of a self-respecting nation. I have, therefore, tried to put together, from original sources, a brief narrative of what I believe to be the true history of the peoples of India."[2] Hunter was conscious of his duty as a historian of India. He felt that "the greatest service which an Indian historian can at present render to India, is to state the facts accurately and in such a way that they will be read."[3] He strongly criticised the approach of Mill and those who read and admired him. "James Mill's *History of British India* would be the standard work but for the unfortunate prejudices and misrepresentations which disfigure that able writer's work. H. H. Wilson's edition of Mill to some extent corrects those misrepresentations; but an accurate history of British India from the original sources has yet to be written."[4] "His *Annals of Rural Bengal* was an attempt, he claimed, to give a fresh interpretation to Indian History."[5]

A certain historical philosophy, which had better been called empire-oriented approach to history, possessed him. R. N. Cust had thus defined

it in his review: "the conquest of British India by the population of a little island in the extreme west is but the last scene of the great drama of the conflict between Asia and Europe, which had gone on for centuries long before the Christian era."[6] A modern researcher has concluded that "the British rulers in India kept a watchful eye on the development of writing and research on Indian history." Indeed, Hunter could not deviate from the policy of Her Majesty's Government. He was influenced by contemporary British historiography which was essentially political. He followed Creighton, Froude, Freeman, Gardiner, Macaulay and Seeley but was not influenced by continental historians as Riehl, Freytag and Burckhardt who had endeavoured to widen the horizon of historical studies beyond the political. Like other imperialist historians he took pride in the political achievement of Britain in India. He failed to believe like Taine "that history is concerned not merely with political history but with the whole social life of nations."[7] He remained a hero-worshipper of the tradition of Carlyle in his defence of Dalhousie. Like Acton he wanted to be a guardian of morality. The didactic element is prominent in his writings. He could not be a philosopher just because he was a patriot.

During his career Hunter was influenced by a number of philosophers, linguists, historians and orientalists. His association with the famous scholars of his time had enriched his equipment and background as a historian. In his early childhood he learnt Latin from Professor Ramsay and Greek from Professor E. S. Lushington. At an early age he became a favourite student of Robert Buchanan. He loved to read Cicero and Tacitus. But Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, Byron and especially Johnson and Goldsmith were his idols. He had a special tuition in Sanskrit and Hindustani from the great orientalist Dr. John Muir. Max Müller was the first to have appreciated his writings and encouraged him for further research. Hodgson helped him in the comparative study of non-Aryan languages of India and High Asia. Professor Henry Blochmann drew his attention to the study of Indian Musalmans and their problems. James Stephen, John Strachey and A. C. Lyall were his friends and collaborators in the study of Law and Finances. He also befriended Col. Meadows Taylor. John Bright and Gladstone admired his writings. Among his close friends were Jowett, Professor Max Müller, Sir William Anson, Sir John Conroy, Mr. Strachan-Davidson and Professor A. A. Macdonell. Among his Indian friends, the prominent were Malabari, the Thakur of Gondal and the Maharaja of Darbhanga.[8]

Hunter tried to have information from various sources. He gave an explicit preference to authenticity although tradition also won his bias. He made a clear exposition of his ideas and approaches. "If I have relied much on the official records, I do not ignore the dangers of their too exclusive use. Contemporary documents tend to foreshorten the perspective

of history. They give a false simplicity of direct cause and effect to transactions which were in reality the results of converging sequences of causes. In untwisting one strand from the cable that binds age to age, we are apt to overestimate the part which the isolated fibre played in the making of the rope. This is the peril, too, of accepting as witnesses men who were parties to a cause. After all, the traditional view embodies the average opinion of the time. I have been careful, therefore, to compare the official documents with the contemporary literature; and when possible the archives of the Dutch and Portuguese records in India and the India Office "[9] Hunter had entertained a mystic sense of attraction towards the Orient from his early days. His biographer has said: "what attracted him to I.C.S. was the Orient, fountain of human knowledge, immutable amid the wrecks of western civilisation, and unfathomable evil to those who seek most eagerly to penetrate her mysteries, which held him under a spell."[10]

Hunter was familiar with many Indian languages, which equipped him exceptionally for researches in the field of history. His interest in the languages of India was aroused by Brian Houghton Hodgson. He started on linguistic researches of the Asiatic people, particularly Himalayan ethnology. His important publication was *A Comparative Dictionary of the Non-Aryan Languages in India and High Asia.* In this Dictionary he emphasised the need for scientific methods of rendering Indian words into English language. It also had a generous plea, most eloquently expressed, for justice to the aboriginal races of India. It was well received by the Press and got him a Doctorate in Law from his university and Fellowships of Ethnological Societies of London and The Hague.[11] He put forward this view that the Western and Indian languages originally belonged to the same speech. "The forefathers of the Greek and the Roman, of English and the Hindu, dwelt together in Western Asia, spoke the same tongue, worshipped the same Gods. The languages of Europe and India, although at first they seem wide apart, are merely different growths from the original Aryan speech. This is especially true of the common words of family life. The names for father, mother, brother, sister, and widow, are the same in most of the Aryan languages whether spoken on the banks of the Ganges, of the Tiber, or of the Thames."[12]

Hunter had been selected by Lord Mayo to organise the gigantic enterprise—a statistical survey of the Indian Empire, its peoples, history and products. His special duty was to submit a comprehensive scheme for utilising the information already collected, for prescribing the principles according to which all local Gazetteers were in future to be prepared, and for the consolidation into one work of the whole of the materials that might be available. His first duty was to travel over the whole of India, so as to put himself into communication with local officials, and see things with his own eyes. These tours, often repeated, gave him an

acquaintance with every corner of the peninsula, and enabled him to study at first hand the local conditions and races from beyond the Khaiber Pass to Comorin. The results were condensed for popular use in the fourteen volumes of the *Imperial Gazetteer of India*. But it was not found possible, within prescribed limits, to combine the economic and political data required for an exact account of the British Indian empire with an adequate treatment of its past. The historical sections were, therefore, reduced to summaries, while an effort was concentrated on completeness from the administrative and industrial points of view. Hunter had served as the Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India. During his tenure, the Statistical accounts of Bengal and Assam were published and the other local Gazetteers compiled. The Imperial Gazetteers of India rank among the monumental works of reference.

The Annals of Rural Bengal was Hunter's epoch-making work. He had broken ground in an untrodden field. Max Müller was the first appreciative enthusiast of this work.[13] Hunter made the annals much more than a catalogue of the deeds of public men in whose shape and glory the masses had no share. He penetrated the inner life of the obscure myriads, born to toil and suffer. He depicted the anarchy which stalked the land after the utter ruin of the Mughal Empire, and the groping efforts to restore law and order made by the British adventurers who assumed the fallen diadem. Mistakes bred of ignorance, and calamities, the bitter fruit of chaotic social conditions, were unsparingly disclosed. The aboriginal races of India, spurned and oppressed by the proud Aryan invaders of the past, found in him a sympathetic advocate. The book came indeed as a revelation to home-staying Britons for whom their Eastern Empire was a mere abstraction. The *Annals* were published in London on 4 April 1868, and a week later the *Glasgow Herald* led off the chorus of praise with which it was greeted by the entire Press. In the *Spectator* of 18th April, editor Meredith Townsend wrote: "If Mr. Hunter does not ultimately compel recognition from the world as an historian of the very first class, of the class to which not a score of Englishmen have belonged, we entirely mistake our trade. We never remember to have heard his name before in our lives; he has no administrative reputation and he can scarcely be thirty or thirty-two years of age; but, unless the book is, as occasionally happens, an exceptional or accidental effort, Mr. Hunter's name will one day be a household word among those who are interested in Asiatic History." *The Annals of Rural Bengal* was received with universal eulogy, for it was immediately recognised that India had now found a voice to make the dry details of administration not only intelligible but attractive.

Rulers of India Series: This series was intended to be "Historical retrospects" rather than personal biographies, their object being to

awaken popular interest in the spectacle afforded by the gradual growth of the British Indian Empire. Hunter opened the series, which later consisted of twenty-eight volumes, with a model memoir on the administration of Lord Dalhousie, and followed it up with *Lord Mayo* condensed from a full-length biography which he had previously written in two volumes. Professor E. T. Stokes has critically evaluated this series as follows: "Hunter hoped that despite the concession to the popular taste by the adoption of the biographical form the series would exhibit a connected view of Indian history and to some extent reveal the laws governing its development. But his hope can hardly be said to have been realized. There is in fact no unifying theme cementing the series, and in the choice of subjects the popular passion for national heroes was allowed to outweigh considerations of historical completeness and proportion. A bare half-dozen volumes were devoted to Indian rulers; the remainder dealt with European and for the most part British figures of the nineteenth century. The failure to achieve even Hunter's limited aim is possibly shown in the fact that the series as advertised carried a sub-title of the historical phase each figure was intended to illustrate (e.g. *The Marquess Cornwallis* [and the consolidation of British Rule]), but this sub-title was in most cases omitted from the title page of the book when it appeared. Half of the series was written by former administrators, the others by military writers including the well-known Captain Trotter and academic historians like S. Lane-Poole and H. Morse-Stephens."[14]

Hunter's last work was the medium of a message of peace and good-will to India. Unfortunately he lived to complete 323 pages of the second volume before his busy brain was stilled by death. He left the first seven chapters of volume II in proof and an eighth in manuscript. The concluding chapter was written by Mr. P. E. Roberts. Sir Alfred Lyall had called it a magnificent theme for the philosopher-historian. His aim and endeavour was to complete the task of writing an authentic history based on historical materials in the record rooms of Bengal. He specified his aim in the Preface: "I found that what has passed for Indian History dealt but little with the staple work done by the founders of British Rule in the east, or with effect on the native races. The vision of our Indian empire as a marvel of destiny, scarcely wrought by human hands, faded away. Nor did the vacuum theory of the inrush of the British power into an Asiatic void correspond more closely with the facts." He held the view that the establishment of British dominion in India is "an inseparable part and the latest example of prolonged interaction of western and eastern forces." He started with a clear notion that "England is the residuary legatee of an inheritance painfully amassed by Europe in Asia during the past four centuries."[15] He fixed for himself the aim of writing the most relevant chapters. "But the chief purpose of the work is to trace the steps

by which the ascendancy of England was won in the east; the changes which it has wrought; and the measures by which it is maintained." Hunter named the stages of western struggle for Asia as a threefold struggle —of Christiandom against Islam, of the Protestant north against the Catholic south, and of the two Protestant sea-powers of the Atlantic for the Asiatic trade. Hunter gave an explanation of the unique position of Britain in India in his day to remove the prevalent misconceptions about the melodrama of British triumphs and the rapid greatness of England in the east. He elaborates that "Europe, just emerged from medievalism, was then making her first experiments in Asiatic Rule. Medieval conceptions of conquest imposed themselves on her exploitation of the Eastern world; medieval types of commerce were perpetuated in the Indian trade. Portugal, Spain and Holland established their power in Asia when these conceptions and types held sway. The English ascendancy in India came later, and embodied the European ideals of the eighteenth century in place of European ideals of the sixteenth. It was the product of modern as against semi-medieval Christiandom. Yet even England found it difficult to shake off the traditions of the period with which this volume deals, the traditions of monopoly in the Indian trade, and of Indian government for the personal profit of the rulers."[16] Despite his repeated claims of preference for impartiality, he could not differentiate himself from popular writers. Hunter could not see anything bad even with Warren Hastings. In the official historical volume of the *Imperial Gazetteer* he quoted Stephen in support of Hastings's deserved acquittal proving him innocent. Indeed, "Writing at the height of the Imperialist phase in England the patriot in Hunter had all but displaced the philosopher."[17]

By the time Hunter was writing on the Mutiny, most of the wrong notions of the Britishers had been corrected, false theories had been rectified, and the reactionary attitude had been fairly balanced. Nevertheless, Hunter deserves praise for attempting a dispassionate explanation of the causes of as delicate a subject as it was subjective to the writer. He wrote: "the various motives assigned for the Mutiny appear inadequate to the European mind. The truth seems to be that Native opinion throughout India was in ferment.... On the other hand, the Company had not sufficiently opened up the higher posts in its service to natives of education, talent, or proved fidelity." Comparing the East India Company rule with the Proclamation of Queen Victoria, he said, "Under the Company this liberal policy was unknown."[18] Although Hunter did not exclude education and steam-engine as causes of the Mutiny, yet he felt that the British rule was not liberal and the Mutiny was a natural consequence.

Hunter's enthusiasm for a better and a cordial rule in India remained benumbed by the bitter criticism against him in England. His biographer

wrote that Hunter had foreseen the vials of official wreck. He told Mr. M. E. Forster some of the incidents of a controversy which caused him acute pain and probably inflicted some injury on his career as a public servant. H. M. Hyndman, who was the leader of the school against India, criticised Hunter's *England's Work for India*. Hyndman regarded the Union of England and India as one between the galley-slave and his cannon-ball.[19]

Within a few weeks of the appearance of the *Annals of Rural Bengal*, the general apathy received a curious illustration in the House of Commons, where 258 members were divided on the question of foreshores, but not even 29 remained to discuss the Indian Council's Bill. But the great lessons taught by the *Annals of Rural Bengal* were taken to heart by a nation which was slow to act on new impressions.[20] It was not enough to give India peace and equal laws, to conquer pestilence and famine. The fellow-subjects were to be taught to protect themselves in the intensified struggle for life to which the very blessings of British life had exposed them. Hunter was alive to the political needs of his day and did not refrain from expressing his views. He advocated the need for absorbing the western-educated classes as it was unwise and impracticable to depend upon a foreign bureaucracy alone. He felt that the continuance of British rule in India depended upon a proper handling of the situation. Like other administrator-historians he also had enough morals to preach and give caution to his British brethren. He wrote with his distinct national pre-possessions.

Hunter tried to be a good friend of Indians. He often advocated reforms for Indians. In 1879-80 he spoke on "what England has yet to do for India?" He pleaded for employment of people in the administration, eradication of the evils of poverty, and economy in the management of army, etc. It inspired Lord Ripon to introduce a measure of Local Self-Government throughout the empire and a larger share to Indians in offices. As an administrator-historian, he had realised that British rule in India could last only by becoming popular. In a letter to Malabari of Bombay, he wrote, "Our rule can be stable only if it rests upon the goodwill and is supported by the co-operation of the people."[21] Again, in *The Times*, he wrote: "My fundamental idea is a United India, but one united no longer by mere force but by the gradual recognition of the rights and the aspirations of the people."[22]

Hunter tried to be dispassionate as a historian. He did not fail to appreciate the ancient culture of India. He wrote: "I have tried to show how an early gifted race, ethnically akin to our own, welded the primitive forest tribes into settled communities. How the nobler stock, set free from the severer struggle for life by the bounty of the Indian soil, created a language, literature and religion, of rare stateliness and beauty."[23] However, despite his passion for objectivity, he let loose some of the generalisations and obsolete ideas showing the incapacity of Indians for becoming

equals of their western counterparts. He recounts them as—contemplative and spiritual aspects of life overpowering the practical and political; Hinduism failing to knit the communities into a coherent nation; nature unfitting Indians for hard work. He was much concerned about the causes of the failure of Indian Society in the growth of a homogeneous society with common nationality. Professor E. T. Stokes has presented his views as follows: "Shifting all manual labour on the shoulders of the despised mixed castes the Brahmin class had grown slothful and effeminate and had been unable to resist conquest by successive waves of more vigorous peoples."[24] It is worthwhile in this connection to consider the views of Hunter regarding the Brahmin of his day. He wrote: "He is an example of a class becoming the ruling power in a country, not by force of arms but by the vigour of hereditary culture and temperance. One race has swept across India after another. Dynasties have risen and fallen, religions have spread themselves over the land and disappeared. But since the dawn of history the Brahmins have calmly ruled; swaying the minds and receiving the homage of the people, and accepted by foreign nations as the highest type of Indian mankind."[25]

Hunter shared with MaxMüller and Maurer the views regarding India's racial character. He tried to contradict the false racial complexes by emphasising: "At a very early period we catch sight of a nobler race from the north-west, forcing its way in among the primitive peoples of India. This race belonged to the splendid Aryan or Indo-Germanic stock, from which the Brahmin, the Rajput and the Englishman alike descend."[26] He held the view that the civilised races of today belonged to the same stock. "The forefathers of the Greek and the Roman, of the English and the Hindu, dwelt together in western Asia, spoke the same tongue, worshipped the same Gods."[27] Hunter had, however, been too much obsessed by the disunity of the Indian people. He countered the twofold division of Indian people into two races of Hindus and Musalmans and explained how they happened to be actually four: 1. Non-Aryan tribes, called the Aborigines, 2. Descendants of the Aryan or Sanskrit-speaking race, called Brahmins and Rajputs, 3. the great mixed population, generally known as the Hindus, which had grown out of the Aryan and Non-Aryan elements, and 4. the Mohammadans.

Contrary to the views of Mill and his school, Hunter was firmly of the view that "the ancient religions of Europe and India had a common origin. They were to some extent made up of the sacred stories or myths which our joint ancestors had learnt while dwelling together in Asia. Several of the very Gods were also the Gods of Greece and Rome; and to this day the divinity is adorned by names derived from the same old Aryan words (Deva, the shining one), by Brahmins in Calcutta, by the Protestant Clergy of England, by Roman Catholic priests in Peru." Against the prevalent false view in England regarding the Brahmin dominance in

Indian society, and the subsequent fury against them, fanned by the alleged Brahmin conspiracy in the 1857 Mutiny, Hunter defended the modern Brahmins by saying that "He is an example of a class becoming the ruling power in a country, not by force of arms, but by the vigour of hereditary culture and temperance."

Hunter was an enthusiastic supporter of social reforms in India. He was keenly interested in the working of Brahmo Samaj and presided over a meeting of Calcutta citizens in the memory of Keshab Chandra Sen. His appreciation of the great reformer's character and work was pregnant with heartfelt eloquence. He laboured earnestly to promote the cause of reform in the position of Hindu women with the help of Malabari of Bombay.

From his intercourse with Williamson sprang Hunter's lifelong sympathy with Christian missions, a sentiment which was rare among European officials in India. In his address to the Society of Arts on "The Religions of India", he said, "And, speaking as an Englishman, I declare my conviction that missionary enterprise is the highest modern expression of the world—wide national life of our race. I regard it as the spiritual complement of England's instinct for colonial expansions and imperial rule. And I believe that any falling-off in England's missionary efforts will be a sure sign of swiftly coming national decay."[28] Indeed, he was a favourite of Buchanan who held, "India was in darkness and would need the era of light present in the western world."[29]

Hunter became a friend of Professor Henry Blochmann. This friendship made him write *The Indian Musalmaans*. In this book he courageously advocated a recognition of the Muslim claims to a share in the governmnet and protection of their country.

Hunter was responsible for the reorganisation of education in India. In 1882 Ripon appointed him to preside over the commission on education. He advocated the gradual withdrawal of the state from direct support and management of institutions of higher education, model text -books based upon the fundamental principles of natural religion such as may be taught in all government and non-government colleges, lectures on duties of a man and a citizen, encouragement of education among the Mohammadans, physical and mental education, and vigorous encouragement for primary education. His recommendations emphasised that primary education should be imparted by the State, District Boards, and Municipalities. Secondary Education should be encouraged through local or private bodies. The Government of India accepted the recommendations of his Commission and all the subsequent improvement in education was upon the lines of his report. Higher education progressed at great speed during the next few decades.

Hunter was keenly interested in the economic studies of India. In his

lectures on India he showed how the tremendous pull of Lancashire in the Lower House had forced the interests of British financiers in India into opposition to the industrial interest of the Indian people. The cry that duties on Manchester cotton were protective had led to the gradual exemption of products of that class. Hunter protested strongly against the narrow and selfish spirit which saddled India with a costly customs establishment, while it deprived her tariffs of the very articles which enabled the expense to be met. The remedy suggested was a daring one, and proved that Hunter was far in advance of his time in grasping the fact that mutual advantages and common interests alone can keep an empire together. It was the abolition of all customs duties on British goods imported into India, and of those levied upon tea and coffee exported thence to English ports. He considered that the immediate loss would be trifling, while both countries would reap vast and direct gains from absolutely unfettered trade.[30] John Bright and Hunter shared their views regarding India. John Bright had written to Hunter: "The fact is, and surely it must be clear to you with your Indian experience, that, with a Government like that of Lord Lytton in connection with the present policy at home, nothing can be done for India. Its revenue and its true interests are sacrificed to what, if it be not a crime, is a craze, and until this system, so mad and so criminal, is got rid of there can be no hope for India. I suspect we are approaching a great calamity in connection with our Indian responsibilities. The men now in power seem blind."[31] Hunter had a thorough knowledge of the Indian finances, having served as a member of the Finance Commission. He unhesitatingly pictured the true condition of India versus the policies of the British Government. He felt that expediency and exploitation alone should not motivate the economic policy. Unfortunately, his sincere suggestions to make good sense prevail upon the rulers regarding Indian policies seem to have fallen on deaf ears.

Hunter regularly wrote for the *Englishman* (Calcutta) and the *Pioneer* during his stay in India. In England he became a regular contributor to the *Times*, where his weekly articles on Indian affairs exercised great influence. His biographer writes: "I have shown that Hunter was instrumental in establishing a *modus vivendi* between the Indian Government and the Press, which, with some important modifications, endures to the present day. The arrangements made by Lord Lytton to this end did not meet with his entire approval, and he was a strenuous opponent of the Vernacular Press Act, afterwards repealed by Lord Ripon, which created a most impolitic distinction between journalists of British and Indian descent. So strongly did he feel the shortcomings of the new system that he was moved to address a remonstrance to the Viceroy."[32]

Hunter was keenly alive to the spirit of the time and was vocal about the demands of the situation. He cautioned the British: "on the one hand we have a teeming peasant proletariat, grossly ignorant, easily stirred

by appeals to their fanaticism, and ever haunted by the spectre of famines. On the other is a compact body of native agitators, the offspring of cheap English education who are steeped to the lips in Western political shibboleths, and ignorant of mankind and of the practical difficulties of Government. The situation is pregnant with danger if it be unskilfully handled. . . ." His biographer has tried to credit him for the changes in the politics of the Congress. "These utterances were taken to heart by the leaders of the Congress movement, which, as we shall see presently, owes whatever result it has achieved to Hunter's influence with the British public. In them, too, we find the origin of nearly every reform which has tended to knit the Indian empire together in the bonds of sympathy. But for the change in opinion brought by these eloquent essays, the Councils of India would not have been placed on a representative basis. The huge, ill-trained forces of the feudatory chiefs would not have been utilised for imperial defence, and our fellow-subjects in the East might never have secured representation in the House of Commons."[33] But Hunter's well-balanced mind led him to reject the extreme demands of the Congress visionaries. He was convinced that India was far from being ripe for popular representation, or a simulacrum of parliamentary Government. National liberties are brought by ages of tears and blood, not gained by frothy declamation and inflammatory newspaper articles. "The Indian Government," wrote Hunter, "must be a strong Government, and any expansion of the popular rights would be dearly bought if it weakened the executive."[34]

As a patriot-historian of the first rank W. W. Hunter was highly appreciative of what British rule has given to India. "Politically," he felt that "so far as can now be estimated, the advance of the British alone saved the Delhi Empire from dismemberment by three Hindu Military powers, the Marathas, Rajputs, and Sikhs. The British rule has endured, because it is wielded in the joint interest of the Indian races."[35] He wrote that "the Queen's reign found the people of India a collection of heterogeneous races. It has moulded them into the beginnings of a nation." He tried to give the British imperialism in India a firm moral basis. Britain was to lead India into the modern world with a paternal authoritarian hand.

Hunter deserves much praise for having discovered a number of historians. He encouraged them by guidance or word of appreciation. Col. G. B. Malleson felt he had grown two inches since receiving the word of praise from W. W. Hunter. Mr. P. E. Roberts became his Secretary and later completed his *The History of British India*. The 'Rulers of India Series' brought to light a number of celebrated historians including Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole. He was a friend of Sir Alfred Lyall, Sir John Strachey, Max Müller, Hodgson, Professor Henry Blochmann, James Stephen, Col. Meadows Taylor, John Bright, B. Malabari, Sir William Anson, Sir John Conroy, Mr. Strachan-Davidson, Professor A. A.

Macdonell, Sir George Birdwood and others. Professor Holden Furber evaluated the work of W. W. Hunter very fairly: "The flamboyance of much of the popular work of the eighties and nineties was also tempered by the foundation which Sir William Wilson Hunter was then laying for professional historical writing on Modern India." He encouraged authors like Fredrick Charles Danvers and William Foster.

W. W. Hunter was the representative of the modern school of historical writing of his day. By his painstaking investigation of contemporary documents, he satisfied the most austere standard of a historian's duty. His narration had the vigour and picturesqueness of a literary style providing flesh to the skeletons of facts. He was a historian to work from primary sources and hence had frequently to combat generalisations which had crystallised into hard-and-fast traditions. Hunter had an honesty of intellect. He had a thorough knowledge of the contemporary theories of history believing in the lessons of history and the strength of historical forces. E. T. Stokes has classed him amongst the administrators who produced, albeit in meagre and incomplete form, genuine books of philosophic history which have stood the test of time. The *Asiatic Quarterly Review* praised him thus: "Next to Macaulay, we know of no writer in the present half of the closing century who succeeds so well as Dr. Hunter does in welding into the form of readable and consecutive story the dry and isolated details of hitherto unpublished Papers found in the archives of Westminster and other places.[36] Hunter was untiringly industrious, and wielded a facile pen. He wrote thought-provoking books in an eminently readable style. His views and writings created an uneasy conscience about the very existence of British Rule in India. He wrote to justify the British Rule in India, but he made the Britishers alive with self-criticism. Ironically, he had proposed to undertake a sympathetic study of Indian history against his deep-rooted patriotism.

REFERENCES

1. C. H. Philips (ed.), *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, pp. 388-89.
2. W. W. Hunter, *A Brief History of the Indian People*, 1897, p. 5.
3. *Ibid.*, p.6.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 199.
5. C. H. Philips, *op. cit.*, p. 394.
6. R. N. Cust, *J.R.A.S.*, B. I. vol. 1899, p. 437.
7. Thompson, *History of Historical Writing*, p. 452.

8. F. H. Skrine, *The Life of Sir William Hunter*, 1901.
9. W. W. Hunter, *The History of British India*, 1899, p. 14.
10. F. H. Skrine, *op. cit.*
11. *Ibid.*, p. 134.
12. W. W. Hunter, *A Brief History of the Indian People*, 1897, p. 83.
13. F. H. Skrine, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-32.
14. C. H. Philips, *op. cit.*, pp. 386-87.
15. W. W. Hunter, *The History of British India*, part I, 1899.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
17. C. H. Philips, *op. cit.*, p. 403.
18. W. W. Hunter, *A Brief History of the Indian People*, 1897, p. 222.
19. F. H. Skrine, *op. cit.*, p. 294.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 372.
22. W. W. Hunter, *The History of British India*, 1899, p. 9.
23. W. W. Hunter, *A Brief History of the Indian People*, 1897, p. 5.
24. C. H. Philips, *op. cit.*, p. 394.
25. W. W. Hunter, *A Brief History of the Indian People*, 1897, pp. 61-62.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
28. F. H. Skrine, *op. cit.*, p. 378.
29. *Buchanan Works*, pp. 39-40.
30. F. H. Skrine, *op. cit.*, p. 293.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 294.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 283.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 373.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 378.
35. W. W. Hunter, *A Brief History of Indian People*, 1897, p. 6.
36. *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, July-October, 1899, p. 231.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

VINCENT ARTHUR SMITH

DR. B. K. MAJUMDAR

(*Jadavpur University, Calcutta*)

THE Nineteenth Century is for the history of India and especially of Bengal a very remarkable century—a century of reform, regeneration and reconstruction in almost every walk of life. It saw the birth of Modern India, the dawning of a new outlook on life, and the beginning of Indian historiography and Indian nationalism. The Indological studies or the study of India's past were started by a band of eminent scholars like Sir William Jones who founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1784. Under the auspices of the Asiatic Society linguistic and literary researches were undertaken for the first time. In the course of a century or so they reaped a rich harvest. By the nineteenth century again, a comprehensive survey of the country started by the orders of the East India Company was completed. Dr. Buchanan Hamilton was the first explorer to carry out this important task first in Mysore in Southern India and then in North Bengal, Bihar and Assam in the second decade of the nineteenth century. Dr. Buchanan's report records the earliest notices of Indian antiquities. In Western India the caves of Ajanta, Elephanta and Kanheri were discovered. In 1862 the Government of India appointed General Alexander Cunningham, an Archaeological Surveyor. It was he who laid the foundation of ancient Indian Geography by careful personal observations. Excavations were carried out at places like Bodh-Gaya, Sanchi, Sarnath and Taxila. Lord Curzon ushered in a new era of Indian archaeology by establishing a Central Department of Archaeology and archaeological researches went on apace.[1] Concerning pure historical research and writing of formal history, the contributions of western scholars are of the highest value. As a matter of fact, Indian historiography was born in the writings and researches of European scholars like Sir William Jones, H. T. Colebrooke, Charles Wilkins, H. H. Wilson, James Prinsep, Max Müller and Alexander Cunningham and others. Col. Tod wrote his *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* in two volumes in 1829 and 1832; Grant Duff wrote his *History of the Marathas* in 1826; M. Elphinstone wrote his *History of India* in 1839; Meadows Taylor wrote *Manual of Indian History* in 1895. In 1904 Vincent Arthur Smith brought out his *Early History of India* (from 600 B.C. to the Muhammedan Conquest including Alexander's Campaign in India). It deals with political history of India from the sixth century B.C. to the end of the Hindu period. By the time Dr. Smith published his monumental work, *Early History of India,* modern research had made considerable headway,

and so in the light of fresh materials drawn from archaeology, numismatics, epigraphy and critical study of Indian literature he was in a position to prepare this brilliant work with great ability and scholarship. In this context we may justly call Vincent Smith a reputed historian of Modern India. To him belongs the credit of writing a full-scale connected history of Ancient and Hindu India based on the most authentic evidence available and providing it with maps, illustrations, genealogies, synchronistic charts and other aids.

Vincent Arthur Smith, son of Aquill Smith, the Irish antiquarian, was born on June 3, 1843 in Dublin. He was the fifth of the thirteen children of his father. After a brilliant academic career at Trinity College, Dublin (he obtained Master's degree from Dublin and Oxford and Litt. D. from the University of Dublin), he joined the Indian Civil Service in 1871. He was posted to the North-West Provinces and Oudh as they were then called. He held a wide variety of administrative posts within the Provinces. He served as the Chief Secretary to the Government of Oudh and the Commissioner of a Division. His work as a Settlement Officer gave him a unique opportunity to devote his energies to the antiquities in which the Ganges Valley is so rich. An inheritor of his father's tastes and an original investigator with a mind sharp as well as deep, his interest in antiquarian studies enabled him "to see the need for co-ordinating the detailed results obtained by various independent scholars." With this object in view he devoted himself heart and soul to historical research and ultimately turned out to be a historian of India.

He married Mary Elizabeth, daughter of William Clifford Tute of Sligo, and had three sons and a daughter. After meritorious service in India he retired early in 1900. His life after retirement at Cheltenham (1900-10) and at Oxford (1910-20) was uneventful, but for a long time he was associated with the Indian Institute at Oxford and rendered valuable services for which he was rewarded with its Gold Medal in 1918. He was a member of the Royal Asiatic Society, London, and a Fellow of the Allahabad University. He was a bit disappointed when he was not elected to the Readership in Indian History at Oxford. But he was made a C.I.E. in 1919 which, "as a recognition of pure scholarship was something outside the beaten track of official decorations." Apart from his historical works, he published a criticism of the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals for Indian reform (1919). As the *Dictionary of National Biography* writes, "he had been too long absent from India, and his taste for antiquarian illustrations was too great for his criticism to carry much weight, especially as his constructive proposals were few and small, but he made a vigorous protest against the spirit of make-believe which was too prevalent at the time in Indian politics." He died at Oxford on February 6, 1920. Dr. Smith's

official career as also his role as the antiquary and historian had had after all a very successful close.[2]

Dr. Smith's major publications include: (a) *Asoka, the Buddhist Emperor of India* (Rulers of India series)—It was the earliest published work and ran into three editions (1901, 1909 and 1920). It was the first monograph on the Indian monarch in the English language, and as such it was widely read and admired. After him a number of scholars chose to write on Asoka. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar's *Asoka* appeared in 1925 (Calcutta University —Carmichael Lectures, 1923), Dr. R. K. Mukherji's *Asoka* in 1928, J. M. Macphail's *Asoka* in 1951 and Romila Thapar's *Asoka and the Decline of the Maurya Empire* in 1961. Both in content and quality Dr. Smith's work is by no means inferior to any of the aforementioned works. A special feature of the book is that it contained English translation of the texts of Asokan epigraphs. The two important issues which in the reign of Asoka have been the subject of much controversy are: (i) Asoka's mission to Greek Kingdoms, and (ii) the nature of Asoka's Dhamma. Different views have been expressed by different scholars. Dr. Smith has not, like Professor T. W. Rhys-Davids,[3] dismissed it as "mere royal rodomontade." As to whether Asoka's Dhamma was Buddhism or not, he says: "The Dhamma of the Edicts is that Hindu Dharma with a difference, due to a Buddhist tinge, nay, rather due to saturation with the ethical thought which lies at the basis of Buddhism, but occupies a subordinate place in Hinduism."[4] *Asoka* along with *Early History of India* and *Akbar the Great Mughal* constitutes his distinct contribution to Indian History.

(b) *The Early History of India* (1904)—It ran into as many as four editions, the fourth edition being revised by S. M. Edwardes, C.I.E., C.V.O., of the Indian Civil Service in 1924. It is a pioneer work. The author rightly claims that his was "the first attempt to present a narrative of the leading events in Indian political history for eighteen centuries." In his introduction Dr. Smith has rejected, in view of the progress in researches on ancient Indian history during the second half of the nineteenth century, the observations of the illustrious historian Elphinstone that "no date of a public event can be fixed before the invasion of Alexander, and no connected relation of the national transactions can be attempted until after the Mahommedan conquest." A new praiseworthy feature of the work is the detailed study of Alexander's famous campaign in North-West India based on the results of labour of modern geographers and archaeologists. The author has incorporated this important topic not as an appendix to the History of Greece as has been done by Thirwall, but as part of that of India. The author is fully conscious of India's deep -lying fundamental unity. He writes: "Her type of civilisation, too, has many features which differentiate it from that of all other regions of the world, while they are common to the whole country, or rather subcontinent,

in a degree sufficient to justify its treatment as a unit in the history of the social, religious and intellectual development of mankind."[5] The authenticity, usefulness and popularity of the book became at once apparent, as it was considered an indispensable standard work intended for advanced students both in India and abroad.

(c) *Catalogue of the Coins in Indian Museum* (Calcutta, vol. I, 1906)—This is a unique and painstaking piece of work on Numismatics, useful for advanced students and research workers who want to do some useful work on ancient Indian history and numismatics.

(d) *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* (Oxford, 1911)—Like his predecessors in the field, viz., Dr. Fergusson, Dr. Burgess, Grünwedel, E. B. Havell and A. Foucher, Dr. Smith was one of the early writers on fine arts—architecture, sculpture and painting. *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* is surely a comprehensive work of sufficient merit. His observations on the subject are critical and appreciative. Referring to the Sarnath Lion Capitol, he says: "It would be difficult to find in any country an example of ancient animal superior or even equal to this beautiful work of art, which successfully combines realistic modelling with ideal dignity and is finished in every detail with perfect accuracy" (p. 60). He praises the ornamented gates of the Sanchi Stupa. The book admirably traces the evolution of the art of India and Ceylon and remains a standard work in the field.

(e) *Akbar, the Great Mughal: 1542-1605* (Oxford, 1917)—This is another well-known publication to his credit. It is a well-documented work based on original research. Dr. Smith was the third among modern writers to write a biography of the third Mughal emperor—the first and the second being the German Count Von Noer (vol. I, 1880; vol. II, 1885 posthumous) and G. B. Malleson (1890) respectively. In spite of the fact that quite a number of scholars wrote on Akbar subsequently, e.g. Laurence Binyon, Dr. R. P. Tripathi, S. R.. Sarma and Dr. A. L. Srivastava, Dr. Smith's book still remains a standard work. In the Preface he gives an account of how he got the inspiration for writing a biography of Akbar. While he was engaged in 1893 in editing the *Rambles and Recollections of Sir William Sleeman*, he noted the author's comment that "Akbar has always appeared to me among sovereigns what Shakespeare was among poets" and that "the competent scholar who will undertake the exhaustive treatment of the life and reign of Akbar will be in possession of perhaps the finest great historical subject as yet unappropriated." Dr. Smith took the hint and set himself to the task in 1915 and completed it in 1917. In writing out this book Dr. Smith has made full and judicious use of the Persian authorities, archaeological data, literature of the reign as well as the contemporary document—the manuscript of the *Mongolicae Legationis Commentarius* by Father A. Monserrate, S. J. These drew scant attention of earlier writers. The book was written as a biography and not as a formal

history in the hope that "a comparatively brief biography enjoys many advantages over a voluminous history crowded with names and details."[6] Akbar was to the author "a born king of man with a rightful claim to rank as one of the greatest sovereigns known to history."[7] Commenting on the incidents of Akbar's duplicity in state-craft he writes—"Experience proves that in practice it is impossible for any person engaged in high affairs of state to be invariably quite straightforward. A certain amount of finesse is recognised to be inevitable in diplomacy and politics."[8] *Akbar, the Great Mughal* will remain for a long time an excellent scholarly work for its scientific approach, exhaustive treatment and graceful literary style.

(f) *The Oxford History of India*, extending from the earliest times to the year 1911, appeared in 1918. This compendious volume of moderate size based on the results of modern research was quite welcome in India and elsewhere. Prior to the publication of this book, no Indian scholar attempted to give us the history of our land—ancient, medieval and modern—in so complete a shape and written in so masterly a style. We quote what he wrote in the preface: "No book on lines at all similar is in existence. The older works of Meadows Taylor, Marshman and others are necessarily useless for the Hindu period which was treated consecutively and critically for the first time in the *Early History of India*, published originally in 1904, and revised in subsequent editions. Notwithstanding the obvious truism that no man can be master in equal degrees of all the parts of India's long story, it is desirable in my opinion that a general history should be the work of a single author. Composite histories, built up of chapters by specialists, suffer from the lack of literary unity and from the absence of one controlling mind so severely that their gain in erudition is apt to be outweighed by their dullness."[9] Being unable to handle the vast mass of materials, he presents the British period of his book as a "readable, reasonably accurate and up-to-date general history."[10] Anyway, Dr. Smith's efforts to write single-handed a general history have not been in vain. It is written in a lucid style without in the least being dull anywhere. This handy volume is an authoritative piece of work. Its only defect is its compression and some observations here and there which have been subject to criticism by later historians who had more reliable materials to work upon and generalise. But the value of the book has been universally recognised.

Dr. Vincent Smith contributed a number of valuable articles to the various journals on Indian history, art, archaeology and coins. Some of them are: (i) Graeco-Roman Influence on the civilisation of ancient India, *JASB*, LVIII, pp. 217 ff., 1889; (ii) Coinage of the Early or Imperial Guptas, *JRAS*, 1889; (iii) Samudragupta, *JRAS*, 1897; (iv) Jaina Ships and other antiquities from Mathura, Allahabad, 1901; (v) Andhra History and Coinage, *ZDMG*, 1902-03; (vi) The Kushan or Indo-Scythian Period of Indian History, *JRAS*, 1903; (vii) The Indo-Parthian Dynasties, *ZDMG*,

1906; (viii) Inscriptions of Mahanama at Bodhgaya, *IA*, XXX, pp. 192-97; (ix) The Sakas in Northern India, *ZDMG*, 1907; (x) The History of the City of Kanauj and of King Yasovarman, *JRAS*, 1908; (xi) Contributions to the Gazetteer of India (Historical vol. II), 1908; (xii) The Monolithic Pillars or Columns of Asoka, *ZDMG*, 1911; (xiii) Sculpture of Ceylon, *JIA*, 1914; (xiv) *The Rambles and Recollections of Sir William Sleeman*, London, 1844—Edited by V. A. Smith, 3rd Ed., 1915 (Sleeman's works are the primary authority on the Thugee in India. By editing them Dr. Smith contributed a good deal to the enrichment of historical literature on India); (xv) A Note on Piprahwa Stupa, *JRAS*, 1918; (xvi) A criticism of the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals for Indian Reform, 1919.

A product of the nineteenth century Britain, Dr. Smith's ideas of History and the function of the historian were in agreement with History as conceived by western scholars of renown like Ranke (1795-1886), Mommsen (1817-1903), Grote (1794-1871) and Bury (1861-1927). His historical method or methodology was undoubtedly modern. Though his field was wider, he was essentially a historian of ancient India and had to build up sober history out of the maze of traditions, tales and myths preserved in Indian literature, Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain, both religious and secular. Before accepting events as historical facts, he invariably went through the processes of examination, analysis, comparison and correlation. This was done in accordance with canons of modern historiography. While summarising the views of historian Collingwood as expressed in *The Idea of History*, published in 1945, Professor E. H. Carr observes: "The function of the historian is neither to love the past nor to emancipate himself from the past, but to master and understand it, as the key to the understanding of the present." In his Introduction to the *Oxford History of India*[11] Dr. Smith aptly adds: "Certain it is that the history of India does not begin with the battle of Plassey as some think it ought to begin, and that a sound, even if not profound knowledge of the older history, will always be a valuable aid in the attempt to solve the numerous problems of Modern India." In presenting the whole history of the land of ancient civilisation Dr. Smith does not appear to be a departure.

The pattern of the study of Indian history is changing. The recent trend is more and more towards the writing of Social and Economic history—history of the common man, and not of princes. This is quite welcome. So far as ancient Indian history is concerned, the study of political history—the rise and fall of numerous kingdoms and republics, a succession of rulers in different parts of this vast subcontinent and their achievements has not been a fruitless endeavour even in this context. As Dr. Smith writes: "A working acquaintance with the political history of India is absolutely essential as a preliminary for the satisfactory treatment

of the story of the development of her ideas."[12] (*Oxford History*, Introduction, p. xiii.)

Dr. Smith was not simply a collector of facts, he was a generaliser, too. Referring to the cession of Parapanisadae or the Indian Caucasus to Chandragupta Maurya by Seleukos Nikator, he says: "The first Indian emperor, more than two thousand years ago, thus entered into possession of that 'scientific frontier' sighed for in vain by his English successors, and never held in its entirety even by the Moghul monarchs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."[13]

A tinge of bias is sometimes noticed in his writings when he observes: "Autocracy is substantially the only form of government with which the historian of India is concerned."[14] He means to say that India has had no political evolution. But are there no references to non-monarchical forms of government and ancient India's experiment on republicanism in Indian literature? Non-monarchical states or republics sometimes equated with oligarchies loom large in classical writers with whom Dr. Smith was not unfamiliar. The existence of corporate activities in political life cannot be ruled out altogether. After all, Dr. Smith was an administrator in a country politically subservient and it is not unexpected of him to have blurred the image of India at places.

To assess the influence that Dr. Smith had on contemporary historians is not an easy task. From the second half of the nineteenth century Indological studies had been receiving their due share of attention at the hands of European scholars in Britain, Germany, France and Belgium, etc. But they have been working in their own field and political history was outside their scope. In India, for example, Rajendralal Mitra wrote *The Indo-Aryans* (1881). Sir R. G. Bhandarkar wrote *Early History of the Deccan* (1881) and *A Peep into the Early History of India* (322 B.C.-500 A.D.) in 1900 and Ramesh Chandra Dutt wrote his *History of Civilisation in Ancient India* (1889-90). Dr. Smith thus belongs to the second group of writers on political history. His influence on future historians, however, is worthy of note. In the first quarter of the twentieth century Indian scholars, following the example of Dr. Smith, came forward to produce political history with fresher materials and wider outlook. In this connection mention may be made of the learned works of C. V. Vaidya (*History of Medieval Hindu India* in three volumes. 1921-26), of Dr. H. C. RayChaudhury (*Political History of Ancient India* from the accession of Parikshit to the extinction of the Gupta dynasty, 1st edition, 1923), of Dr. H. C. Ray (*Dynastic History of Northern India* in two volumes, 1931 and 1935) and of Professor K. A. Nilkanta Sastri (*A History of South India*, 1955). Everybody who undertook research on any aspect of ancient Indian history had to acknowledge his debt to Vincent Smith either by supporting or criticising the views put forward by him. Professor Hemchandra RayChaudhuri took up as his field of research that portion of ancient India's political history which Dr. Smith

ignored as too hazy and difficult to arrange and systematise. Dr. Ray-Chaudhuri's remarks will not be out of place here:

The *first notable* attempt to "sort and arrange the accumulated and ever-growing stores of knowledge" was made by Dr. Vincent Smith. But the *excellent* historian, failing to find sober history in bardic tales, ignored the period immediately succeeding "the famous war waged on the banks of the Jumna between the sons of Kuru and the sons of Pandu", and took as his starting point the middle of the seventh century B.C. "The aim of the present writer has been to sketch in outline the dynastic history of Ancient India including the neglected period."[15]

Speaking on 'The Study of History' Lord Acton[16] observed: "The main thing to learn is not the art of accumulating material, but the sublimer art of investigating it, of discerning truth from falsehood and certainty from doubt. It is by solidity of criticism more than by the plenitude of erudition, that the study of history strengthens, and straightens, and extends the mind." History is often described both as a Science and an Art. As a Science, it is "impartial...weighing documents, accumulating evidence, sorting out the false wherever detected,...to fulfil the imperative demand of the scientific spirit." As an Art, it is "mainly the creature of imagination and literary style."[17] Dr. Smith's ideas of History and his historical method unmistakably show that as a historian he was a scientist and an artist rolled into one. He was a true investigator and his chief merit is sobriety and caution—qualities which are absolutely necessary for the historian who has to dig laboriously into the obscure past. Except for his "occasional protest against slipshod research and muddled thinking, his published works give little indication of his private character which was thoroughly Irish—genial, outspoken and hospitable." Research and antiquarian interests remained with him an ever-flowing fountain of fresh delight. He spent more than fifty years of his life on Indological studies. Reading was his only recreation.

It is fervently hoped that the present generation of students and teachers engaged in historical research will long remember the great service rendered by V. A. Smith in the cause of Indian history. Considering the volume, variety and value of his work, Dr. Smith must be pronounced an eminent historian of Modern India.

REFERENCES

1. *Ancient India*, no. 9, 1953, special Jubilee Number.
2. *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 1912-21 volume, London; Who Was Who, 1916-28 volume, p. 977; *J.R.A.S.*, London, 1920; The *Times*, 7 February, 1920.
3. *Buddhist India* (Indian edition), p. 195.
4. *Asoka*, 3rd edition, pp. 59-60.
5. *Early History of India*, 4th edition, p. 5.
6. *Akbar, the Great Mughal*, Preface, p. vi.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 126.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 256.
9. *Oxford History of India*, 1920, Preface.
10. "The George Macaulay Trevelyan Lectures", Cambridge, 1961, p. 26.
11. *Oxford History of India*, Introduction, p. xxiii-iv.
12. *Ibid.*, p. xiii.
13. *Early History of India*, 4th edition, p. 126.
14. *Oxford History of India*, Introduction, p. xi.
15. *Political History of Ancient India*, part I, p. 1.
16. Lecture delivered at Cambridge, June, 1895.
17. J. T. Shotwell, *The History of History*, pp. 9-11.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava

WILLIAM HARRISON MORELAND

CHITTABRATA PALIT

(*Jadavpur University, Calcutta*)

W. H. MORELAND founded a definite school of historical research which has its honoured place in the evolution of historiography in India. A keen student of medieval Indian history, he made revenue administration his staple of research. In handling records for the period from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century, he was really a trend-setter. It was his singular achievement that he could make an engaging history out of dry statistics.

William Harrison Moreland was born in Northern Ireland in 1868. He was first educated at Clifton College and was thence drafted to Trinity College, Cambridge, as a probationer in the Indian Civil Service. He took a First in law tripos and became an LL.B. in 1889.

The young civilian came over to India and his first charge was that of Assistant Settlement Officer in the N. W. Provinces (later known as the United Provinces or U.P.). Here began his long apprenticeship in Indian land revenue administration for twenty-five rewarding years. He was appointed an Assistant Commissioner in 1894, Joint Magistrate in 1897 and Collector, U.P., in 1899. Finally, he rose to the position of Director of Land Records and Agriculture in 1899 from which office he retired in 1914. As an administrator, he had quite a few laurels to his credit. He was responsible for the revision of the records of rights procedure and for the training of *quanungos*. He also formed the first agricultural college at Kanpur. He became a C.I.E. in 1905. In 1907-08 he was honoured with a special commendation for his work in the famine of that year. In 1912 he visited Australia as an expert in rust-resistant wheats. Even after retirement from the I.C.S. he acted as the agricultural adviser in a princely state in central India. In 1916 he repaired to England, and in 1938 end came to an illustrious career in service and historical research.[1]

Moreland was not the only civilian with a flair for historical research. Here, he was indeed in august company. He joined the band of such celebrities as Sir George Grierson, Sir Edward Maclagan, Mr. Vincent Smith, Mr. R. Sewell, Mr. M. Longworth Dames, Mr. R. Burn, Mr. A. C. Chatterjee and Mr. A. Yusuf Ali. He derived his inspiration from this long tradition. As in the case of his brothers in profession, it was only to be expected that a raw recruit from England like Moreland should try to know India in general and its traditional land revenue system in particular for a conscientious discharge of his duties in the land revenue

department. As J. B. Harrison puts it, "Service in the revenue line has made historians." Moreland's passion for past records of the land revenue department stemmed from this "groping for information".

The first few fruits of this new experience were the three manuals, (i) *The Agriculture of the United Provinces* (1904), (ii) *The Revenue Administration of the United Provinces* (1911) and (iii) *Notes on the Agricultural Conditions and Problems of the United Provinces* (1913). In his preface to the first book, Moreland writes, "The welfare of the cultivator may be affected for good or for evil by the actions of two distinct classes, the officials with whom he has to deal and the land-holders (or their subordinates) under whom he holds his land....The present volume has been compiled with the object of supplying an introduction to the subject which may be of use to all who have to deal with the cultivator." He was not just giving guide-lines to the junior officers but also setting a goal for them, i.e. welfare of the cultivator. From the very outset the peasant became the hero of his subject-matter. He remained so not only in the field of land revenue but also in the wider context of Indian history as a whole. Most interesting in the book are his maxims of management. He writes, "The rent should be fixed for a fair term of years; it should be considerably below the highest rent which a tenant could possibly pay; it should be collected strictly in ordinary years but leniently in years of bad produce; a tenant who pays fairly well should be kept on the land."[2] This remained a fixed tenet in all his future judgements on revenue administration. The second book was to serve an identical purpose, but its attempts "to illuminate the present with the past" can be called the genesis of Moreland's future *magnum opus*. Moreover, in this work his penchant for glossary finds its first expression. This prying on terms like *zamindar* gave him a glimpse of the truth "that the early English officer found *zamindars* and left land-owners."[3] The hibernation of the historian before he crossed the frontiers of U.P. and took a big leap forward on to Delhi can be detected in these lines of the introduction: "In order to obtain a clear view of the revenue administration, the first great essential is to realise that it is a gradual development: the land-revenue was not imposed by the English, nor by their forerunners, the Mughals; the principle that the cultivator of the soil should provide for the greater part of the expenses of Government seems to have been followed in India from the earliest times."

By 1920 Moreland was sufficiently equipped to write an economic history of Mughal India. His administrative experience and research had been fairly organised. He had a good grounding in economics. This last trait was revealed by a text-book on economics which he wrote in 1920. *An Introduction to Economics for Indian Students* was a standard text for its lucidity. In this book again, his other maxim for management can be traced. He would prefer state socialism to industrial freedom. In the chapter on National Economy, he would call an administration fair if it

undertook even distribution and encouraged production. 1920 was also the year of publication of his major work, *India at the Death of Akbar: An Economic Study.*

The period between 1916 and 1920 can be regarded as the cradle -stage of the major work. In 1916 Moreland had left his service and returned to England. He had seriously delved into the *Ain* to extract valuable statistics for his construction of Akbar's revenue system. To do this he had to acquire the knowledge of Persian. During his tenure of office he had explored the British settlement and revenue records. He was next exploring Abu-l-Fazl and Badauni. The evidence of this brisk activity can be seen in the articles he wrote on the *Ain* which preceded his major work in 1920. They are: (a) "The *Ain-i-Akbari*—A possible Base-line for the Economic history of Modern India" in the *Indian Journal of Economics* (1916); (b) "Prices and wages under Akbar" in the *JRAS* (October, 1917); (c) (in collaboration with A. Yusuf Ali) "Akbar's Land-Revenue System as described in the *Ain-i-Akbari*" in the *JRAS* (January, 1918); (d) "The value of money at the Court of Akbar" in the *JRAS* (October, 1918); and (e) "The Agricultural Statistics of Akbar's Empire" in the *Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society*, vol. II (June, 1919). In the last article he wrote, "Abul Fazl's statistics disclose a definite picture of the economic condition of the country. It remains to enquire whether that picture is true or probable."

The result of this enquiry was the book, *India at the Death of Akbar.* In its Preface, he writes, "If it be permissible to assign a precise date to what is essentially a gradual transition, we may say that the medieval history of India ended and the modern history began in the year 1608 when the English ship, *Hector*, reached Surat." This serves as the clue to all his future writings. The working of the economic forces was all that mattered to Moreland in history. As to its primacy, he was never in two minds. The title of the book was a grand departure. It did not concern Akbar the Great or the Great Moghul. Its theme was India, and as the first chapter indicates, the country and its people. By people, he understood the peasant, as he was to state later. It was a kind of regicide in modern Indian historiography. Tables were never so drastically turned. In Elizabethan language, foot now dictated the head. In this book Moreland tells us of the country and the people, the administration and its effect on trade and industry, the consuming classes, agricultural production, non-agricultural production, commerce, standard of life (where we get the upper, middle and lower classes), the wealth of India and its distribution. His enquiry led him to detect an official called *Jagirdar* who was assigned the revenue of a *jagir* in lieu of pay. "They were less concerned to promote the prosperity of their charges than to keep things quiet, to see that complaints did not reach the Emperor's ears and meanwhile to amass or to spend, as much wealth as could be collected under these

conditions. Jahangir believed in frequent transfers and the certainty of a speedy change meant increased activity in exploitation."[4] His maxim for public welfare was rudely violated by this class and they remained one of the chief culprits for Mughal misrule in his subsequent works. It was a searching diagnosis. But this was not the only explanation he offered for the oppression of peasants. The other factor was the high rate of legal and extra-legal assessments which robbed the peasant of all his surplus and reduced him to a vagrant. Even at Akbar's time, the rate was one -third of the gross produce under the *zabt* system, not to speak of *jagirs*.[5] On the basis of his calculations, "Akbar claimed as revenue at any rate about twice as much as present-day land-holders claim for rent."[6] In the last line there is an obvious comparison with the British system in favour of the British. The net result of this system was a very unfair distribution of wealth. "The upper classes were able to live much more luxuriously in the time of Akbar than now,"[7] while "the surplus for which Akbar's peasants could hope was at the best very small; if half the produce was required to cover necessary expenditure and one-third was claimed as revenue, there remained only one-sixth of the gross income expected in favourable years, and a very slight loss due to accidents of season would absorb the whole of the anticipated balance. Reduction of the revenue -demand by one-half would obviously double the amount of the free surplus and thus leave the peasant a comparatively much larger sum of money to spend in prosperous times while enabling him to carry on his business unaided in less favourable years. Speaking broadly, that is the difference between Akbar's time and the present-day."[8] Thus, all his arguments in the book are summed up and the oppressive Mughal system serves as a burlesque to the benevolent British system.

From Akbar to Aurangzeb was a difficult journey with very few landmarks. The pilgrim's progress was made known to the public through an article in 1922 in which Moreland interpreted two newly discovered *farmans* of Aurangzeb dated 1665 and 1668 respectively.[9] The journey was accomplished. *From Akbar to Aurangzeb* came out in 1923. He had by then learnt Dutch and tapped the Dutch sources for the construction of the history of this period. It was possible for him after all these labours to tell us about the Asiatic Environment, the development of Dutch and English commerce in India, changes in foreign commerce in India, the establishment of new markets in western Europe, the course of Indian markets, Production and Consumption, the economic results of the Famine, etc. These were new additions to the old scheme. The fate of the peasant during this period was still worse. "An Indian peasant might thus find himself under a master of one of five different classes, a farmer of the revenue, a salaried official, a *jagirdar* in temporary possession, a private person or corporation with a larger and possibly a permanent tenure, or finally, a *Zamindar*; and the powers of his master were so great and the

chances of superior interference so small that his welfare depended principally on the master under whom he happened to come."[10] Grants and assignments were the dominant features of Jahangir's and Shahjahan's times.[11] From Abdul Hamid's *Badshahnama* he cites the convincing proof that "the ordinary peasant was therefore subject to an assignee rather than an official collector."[12] The claim of half of the produce had become a tradition by the time of Aurangzeb. Moreland was able to show this from the reading of the *farmans* of Aurangzeb. So, the high rate of half of the produce and the exactions of the harpies called Assignees and Grantees through the practice of summary assessment (*nasaq*) made rack-rent the standard of Aurangzeb's assessment. The plight of the peasants could be described only by a Bernier or a Manucci.

The third major work of Moreland was to follow a few years later. In the interval he had learnt more Dutch and rendered Pelsaert's account of Jahangir's India in Dutch into English (1925). *The Agrarian System of Moslem India* appeared in 1929. It completes his enquiries into medieval practices of land-revenue assessment. It covers the period from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century in addition to the Mughal period. The book attracts readers for its precision in treatment and definition of terms. The striking facts of the book include Alauddin Khalji's high rate of half of the produce, and Sher Shah's rate of one-third. The latter is proved by a careful scrutiny of the *Ain* (1. 297 ff). The dispute as to the rate is thus set at rest.

Besides these, Moreland translated and edited two travel accounts of Dutch observers from the original for the Hakluyt Society, *Relations of Golconda* in 1931 and *Peter Floris* in 1934. His last was a text-book on Indian history in collaboration with a fellow-civilian, Sir Atul Chatterjee, which came out in 1936. These major works were interspersed by numerous articles and book-reviews in research journals.

Before we discuss his methodology from a technical point of view, let us examine some of his leading ideas to explain the course of Indian history. Moreland believes in the primacy of economic forces in the history of human civilisation. It is replete with statements that the Mohammedan chronicles "deal only with the externals of history,—dynasties, war and rebellion," or that the modern period in Indian history begins from the year 1608 when the English ship, *Hector*, reached Surat. He does not take into account the influence of caste, social habit, landedness and absence of trading habit, religion, despotism and British impact on society which interact and produce the panorama of Indian history as much as the economic forces. His analysis becomes monistic. He could hardly emerge from his narrow groove of revenue administration. In the ultimate balance-sheet, he has held revenue administration as the parent of Indian poverty. But, in doing so, he has done a good turn to the Indian peasant.

The latter has been restored to his rightful position as the central figure in the saga of Indian life. In his introduction to the *Agrarian System of Moslem India*, he writes: "During the main period of Moslem rule in India, lasting from the thirteenth to the eighteenth centuries, a kingdom had three essential constituents, the Sovereign who ruled it, the Army which supported the throne and the Peasantry which paid for both.... The dynastic and military history of the period is now tolerably accessible to students, but it is impossible to obtain from the existing literature a general or connected view of the position of the peasants in their relations with the state and it is this gap which I now attempt to fill."

The second notable bias in his writings is his tendency to use Moslem misrule and rack-rent as a burlesque to the benevolent rule of the British Government. But a review of the periodic assessments and the course of the Permanent Settlement will show that maximisation of rent was also the target of British rule in India. The *zamindars* or assignees were perpetuated in the holdings which did not belong to them with all their evils. The fixed rate was not low in view of the exhausted nature of the major holdings in 1793. Only the *zamindars* of the summarily assessed holdings benefited from these transactions. But to make good the loss, the rigid Sunset Law was promulgated, and virtually, the Mughal system of transfer of *jagirs* was revived. As a result, the highest bidders at the auction, the mercenary absentee landlords, emerged and rack-rented the countryside. In Mughal times, the tenancy rights were hereditary and *khudkasht* ryots were never evicted. But, in the British system, it became the order of the day. Even by tenancy legislations, the rapacity and extra-legal exactions of the landlords could not be controlled.[13]

Turning to the methodology of Moreland, the first thing that has to be noted is his insistence on accurate definition of terms and their correct meaning. All his works contain copious glossaries and appendices which have the value of new archives for researchers. He had put to use a kind of documents and records, never tapped before. Settlement and revenue reports, agricultural statistics, administrative reports and *farmans* contained in Abu-l Fazl, Badauni, Abdul Hamid Lahori and other less known tracts have been wonderfully woven into lively history by this doyen of economic historians.

Moreland also showed a great zeal in learning new languages to have access to new sources buried in them. Thus, he picked up Persian, French, Portuguese and Dutch to read records in these languages correctly in the original. His dependence on translators like Blochmann, Jarret and Dowson did not stand him in good stead as they had imported English expressions of Indian terms with different connotations. The fluidity of terminology in course of centuries had baffled him in many places. The word *Diwan* was a typical example.[14] He cautions future students of medieval history against a few pitfalls like alternation of individual digits, mis-alignments,

etc.[15] At a very advanced age (probably after 1918) he started learning Dutch to dig into the Dutch records which were supposed to be rich sources of information for the period. He writes, "The neglect of Dutch sources for this period is all the more to be regretted, because in some respects they are definitely superior to the English. The Dutch merchants were to set down in black and white many things which the English were content to take for granted; their more extensive operations gave them wider views; and the discipline enforced by the authorities at Batavia produced detailed and precise records of transactions carried out in distant places."[16] His craving for new language and new knowledge to be had by it should be emulated by scholars.

Lastly, he was very cautious and discriminating in the selection of sources. To assure objectivity, he would not rely solely on Moslem accounts which were mostly panegyrics of court *amlahs* and paid minstrels. Even when he got a corrective like Badauni to Abu-l Fazl, he would be on his guard against the exaggerations of the former. He, therefore, tried to check his Persian references by the whole range of travel accounts in different European languages on which he could lay his hands. Any reader of his books will be impressed by the array of such references in them.

Even then, he would sigh for many other untapped records in regional archives and minor tracts which might be discovered in future. He would, therefore, call his works incomplete and mere essays and guidelines for the future historians. It was with great humility that he wrote these lines in his introduction to *The Agrarian System of Moslem India*: "I hold to the belief that scattered here and there, mainly in private hands, there must be many documents relating to grants, assignments and other forms of tenure, as well as to certain other aspects of agrarian administration which, if they could be brought to light, would enable some future student to convert this essay into a history by correcting my mistakes and filling the gaps in my information."

The influence of Moreland on contemporary and later historians was really great. It was indeed a new awakening for the students of the economic history of medieval India. His contemporaries, Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Dr. Kalikaranjan Kanungo, Roberts, Maclagan and Baden-Powell, reacted very sharply to his writings. A new hunt for revenue records and *farmans* was launched by them. They engaged in disputations, adding new dimensions to research. The romantic tradition and royal legends were on their retreat. Suddenly, the peasant became the cynosure of historians. Among the later historians who toed his track mention may be made of P. Saran, Irfan Habib, B. R. Grover and others. Irfan Habib has really taken the cue from Moreland and has very admirably rehashed his thesis, thus fulfilling his cherished desire. He has examined, besides the sources used by Moreland, numerous other regional records, land-grants and

foreign depositories to which Moreland could not have access, and corrected him on many points. His *Agrarian System of Mughal India* (1963) is an eloquent tribute to W. H. Moreland with whom, he says, "I have at many places found myself in disagreement" (Preface). Some of the correctives may be discussed. The most important of them is the fact that Akbar's rate of assessment, which Moreland believed to be uniformly one-third of the produce, was neither uniform at all places nor one-third in reality. Habib writes, "But the revenue was fixed in cash, not kind. It is very unlikely that the prices or the quotations of prices, which formed the basis for commuting the demand into cash, were identical with those at which the peasant parted with his crop at the time of the harvest when there was a glut in the market. If so, the actual imposition even on an average must have considerably exceeded one-third of the produce. It must also be noted that since the demand under *zabt* was based, first, on one unvaried crop rate and then, finally, on unvaried cash rates, the peasant was left to bear practically all the risks from the inconsistency of harvests. In Kashmir, Akbar's administration found the demand to be set in theory at one-third of the produce, but amounting in reality to two -thirds. Akbar ordered that one-half should be demanded."[17] Second and corollary to this, is the very important correction to the Moreland belief that Aurangzeb had increased the demand from one-third to one-half on the basis of the *Shariat*, and that his rule was most oppressive as he had allowed the whip for collection in his *farman*. But Habib points out that "there is no proof that Aurangzeb set about reformulating the *zabt* revenue rates on the basis of half of the crop rates. The *Shariat* was concerned with the actual produce and not the average or arbitrarily fixed yield on paper."[18] The third refers to the term, *Jama-i-Dahsala*. Habib writes, "Moreland believed that the *Jama-i-Dahsala* was instituted by simply averaging the total revenue demand actually levied upon the peasants in the preceding ten years. But it is difficult to see how this can be maintained when we are distinctly told by Abu-l-Fazl that "the essence of this innovation is that having ascertained the ten years' state (*hal-i-dahsala*) of every pargana in regard to the categories of cultivation and the levels of prices, they fixed the tenth part thereof as the annual revenue (*mal-i-har-sala*)."[19] Moreland is also corrected on the interpretation of the word, *zamindar*. He translated it into vassal chiefs. Here Moreland has fallen into the pitfall of misalignment in the *Ain* as translated by Blochmann, a thing against which he himself had cautioned historians. Habib writes, "There is no easier way of refuting the identification with vassal chiefs than by showing that the *zamindars* so-called did exist in the regularly administered territories and were by no means confined to the tributary states....Why this has not been obvious so far is owing to a single undetected error in Blochmann's standard edition of the *Ain*. In this edition, presumably for the convenience of printing, the statistics under the 'Accounts of the Twelve

Provinces' were not reproduced in their original tabular form found in the best manuscripts of the work. Blochmann not only dispensed with the columns of the original tables, but also dropped without any explanation the column headings. His reader has, therefore, no means of knowing that the names of castes entered against each pargana in these tables belong really to a column headed *zamindar* or occasionally *bumi* in the manuscripts."[20] So, the *zamindars* existed in the Regulation area and were a kind of intermediaries. Finally, the dispute over *nasaq*. According to Habib's interpretation, *nasaq* means "any avoidance whatsoever of the process of actual assessment by acceptance of something previously worked out or determined."[21] Even Akbar after the thirteenth year of his reign adopted *nasaq*. So, Aurangzeb's orders for *nasaq* should not mean premium on arbitray over-assessments. These are, indeed, revelations. Thus, Habib thinks that the oppression of the peasantry was not so much the work of the king as of the assignees, over whom even Akbar could not maintain effective control, and far less Aurangzeb. The Mughal power depended on them, and the prop could not be removed. Administrative oppression was magnified beyond measure by Moreland who saw nothing outside revenue administration. Nevertheless, Moreland remains unassailed in most of his conclusions, and all later scholars in the field owe a deep debt of gratitude to the pioneer.

REFERENCES

1. J. B. Harrison, "Moreland" in C. H. Philips (ed.), *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, pp. 310-18.
2. *The Agriculture of the United Provinces* (1904), p. 154.
3. *The Revenue Administration of the United Provinces* (1911), p. 5.
4. *India at the Death of Akbar* (1920), pp. 72-73.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 288.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 296.
9. "The Development of the Land-Revenue System of the Mughal Empire", The *JRAS*, January, 1922, pp. 19-55.
10. *From Akbar to Aurangzeb* (1923), p. 236.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 249-50.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 250.
13. Irfan Habib, *The Agrarian System of Mughal India*, pp. 117-18.
14. *The Agrarian System*, Introduction.
15. "The Agricultural Statistics of Akbar's Empire", *Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society*, June, 1919, pp. 1-39.

16. *From Akbar to Aurangzeb*, Introduction.
17. Irfan Habib, *op. cit.*, p. 192.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 196.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 205-06.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 218-19.

Rajeshkumar Gambhava